

282051

JPRS-TAC-86-073

11 SEPTEMBER 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19990422 102

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

8
105
A46

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

11 SEPTEMBER 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

- Soviet Journal Calls SDI 'Insane Political Thinking'
(M. Somov; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 7, Jul 86)... 1

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

- Soviet Journal on Gorbachev 15 January Proposal
(P. Volodarov; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 7,
Jul 86)..... 11

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

- Soviet UN Association Issues Statement on Nuclear Test Moratorium
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 28 Jul 86)..... 19
- USSR: Commentaries on Anniversary of Unilateral Test Moratorium
(Various sources, various dates)..... 20
- U.S. Rejection 'Shortsighted', by Vitaliy Korionov 20
U.S. Arrogance Noted, by Marat Zubko 22
Repeated Extensions Noted 23
'Shutting Off Arms Race', by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov 24
World Opinion Demands Ban, by Vladimir Katin 26
- USSR's Kapitsa: Moratorium Extension Decision Due Shortly
(Moscow TASS, 6 Aug 86)..... 29

USSR: Comments on Gorbachev Moratorium Extension Announcement (Various sources, various dates).....	30
U.S. 'Hastened' To Reject Appeal	30
Foreign Ministry Press Briefing	30
Prague TV Version	31
Arbatov Analyzes U.S. Stance, by G. Arbatov	31
No Change in U.S. Position	33
Speakers' Comments Criticized	33
Solton Commentary, by Yuriy Solton	34
Zholkver Reports Responses, by Aleksandr Zholkver	35
U.S. 'Defensive Position' Noted, by Dmitriy Biryukov	36
CNN Comments Reported	36
Report From Washington, by Vladimir Dunayev	37
UK Reaction Termed 'Strange', by Vladimir Malyshev	37
FRG's Genscher Praises Address	38
Bundestag Official on Extension	38
Mies Welcomes Announcement	39
Sweden's Carlsson Statement Noted	39
PRC Notes Speech	39
DPRK Foreign Ministry Hails Offer	39
PRK's Sim on 'Important Step'	40
Honecker Highlights Decision	40
Polish Government Lauds Plan	40
IZVESTIYA Commentator Cited	41
Delegates View Issue	41
UN Press Conference Held	42
Pasko Rounds Up Reaction	42
Washington Press Conference Held	43
U.S. 'Softened' Position Noted, by Viktor Glazunov	44
White House View Assailed, by Aleksandr Zholkver	44
Regan's Comments Outlined	45
Bovin Commentary, by Aleksandr Bovin	45
Round Table Examines Issue, by Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, et. al.	46
PRAVDA Editorial	52
Sokolov Address on Statement, by A. Belousov	54
'Top Priority', by Vladimir Pozner, et al.	55
Dailies Carry Comments	59
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial	63
Impact on Peace Movement Noted	65
Moscow Gorispolkom Press Conference, by Olga Vasilenko	65
Scientists Support Stand	66
Workers, Academician Pleased	66
IPPNW Chairman Lauds Gorbachev	67
U.S. Stand Lamented, by Boris Andrianov	68
Japanese Reaction Cited	69
Japanese CD Delegation Comments, by V. Kuznetsov, V. Antonov	69
PRAVDA Reviews Reaction	70
PRC Press Cited	71

Moscow TV Round Table Discusses Moratorium Issue (Sergey Petrovich Kapitsa, et al.; Moscow Television Service, 1 Aug 86).....	72
PRAVDA Cites Canadian Physicist on Moratorium (Derek Paul Interview; Moscow PRAVDA, 7 Aug 86).....	82
USSR: Reports on Joint Monitoring Experiment in Kazakhstan (Moscow PRAVDA, 26 Jul 86; Moscow Domestic Service, 28 Jul 86).....	84
Reliability Stressed, by A. Pokrovskiy Soviet Scientist Interviewed	84 86
Soviet Journal Discusses Nordic NFZ Issue (V. Dmitriyev; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 7, Jul 86).....	88
Briefs CD Seismic Experts Session	95

RELATED ISSUES

USSR Journal Stresses Importance of Arms Agreements for Europe (D. Tomashevsky; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 7, Jul 86).....	96
--	----

/12223

SOVIET JOURNAL CALLS SDI 'INSANE POLITICAL THINKING'

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 7, Jul 86 pp 81-89, 107

[Article by M. Somov]

[Text]

The 27th Congress of the CPSU analysed the main tendencies and specifics of present-day world development, drew very important conclusions reflecting the dialectics, logic and dynamism of this development and the modern philosophy of world security, and came up with a practical action programme. The 27th Congress noted a turning point in international affairs demanding to come over from the policy of balancing on the brink of war to normal civilised forms of interrelationship of countries with different social systems, to a policy capable of safeguarding peace.

Everything considered, the struggle in the coming years is going to be mainly over these issues. This struggle is expected to be complex for the two socio-economic systems differ a great deal in their preparedness and ability for assessing these issues.

Without dramatising the present situation, socialism, nevertheless, soberly assesses the current moment as one which requires taking serious responsibility when mankind is faced with a crucial choice between survival or self-destruction.

In the capitalist world, unbiased analysis of the current events can make its way with great difficulty through the solid rock of prejudice in the thinking of the ruling elite, but it is still unwilling to soberly assess the realities of the world and its future and to draw serious conclusions. This response, noted the 27th CPSU Congress, is an indication of the wear and tear suffered by its internal "systems of immunity", of its social senility, which reduces the capability to perceive new ideas and augments its degree of recklessness.

One relatively new element of this symptom is the "strategic defense initiative" (SDI), dubbed "star wars" programme in the United States itself, advanced by the US President on March 23, 1983.

The deranged political thinking which conceived the SDI and is now forcing its implementation is revealed above all in the reliance on the force of arms with the use of the latest achievements of science and technology, with the purpose of imposing one's will on others.

Back in 1918, almost 30 years before the first atomic bomb was exploded, Lenin warned that, due to the use of the newest powerful breakthroughs in science and technology, war "might, ... in fact, it inevitably would, undermine the very foundations of human society".¹ Mankind today has enough weapons for self-destruction. The scientific and techno-

logical revolution in the last quarter of this century gave rise to a rapid improvement of both the productive forces of mankind and the means of destruction, for the first time enabling man to destroy all life on earth.

The scientific and technological revolution has different effects in different socio-political systems, but in all cases it greatly increases the demands placed on the entire organisation of international activities.

The SDI acts in a diametrically opposite direction, destabilising all international activities, and has already begun to change the course of events in a direction which can become irreversible. The thinking and actions of the SDI authors betray their inability to get away from habitual but long outdated views.

Addressing the Americans late in February this year, the US President again alleged that the unrestrained buildup of the US military muscle was conducive to the success of the talks with the Soviet Union. Strength, he said, is the best argument we have to persuade our adversaries to negotiate in earnest. We shall not, he said, leave America without its trump card now that we are sitting at the negotiating table with the Soviet Union.

In technological terms, the idea of the SDI is to hit intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) all along their flight trajectory. This is what makes the SDI different from the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) schemes envisaging defence measures only in the final section of the flight trajectory, which were considered and adopted at the turn of 1970s.

This SDI concept is well in keeping with the goal it set—to create an almost total ballistic missile defence. The fact that the new system is multi-layer is expected to make it far more effective.

New types of weapons are required under the new programme, primarily those operating on new physical principles. Among these are chemical and excimer lasers, free-electron lasers, X-ray lasers with nuclear blast radiation pumping, particle beam accelerators, electromagnetic guns, homing interceptor projectiles, etc. It looks as if space strike weapons being developed in the United States are designed not only for hitting the satellites and ballistic missiles at the post-boost stage, but also for preemptive first strikes at a number of ground targets. Accurate and powerful enough for destroying part of ballistic missiles in flight, space weapons can be used for hitting other strategic weapons, as, for instance, aircraft in the airfields, before take-off.

The development of space strike weapons and space combat stations requires new detection, identification and targeting subsystems, and also subsystems to control a large-scale anti-ballistic missile system with space-based echelons. Such a system would most probably be put into operation automatically, for too little time, thirty seconds or so, would be left for decision-making, in the event the attacking side launches a large number of fast-boost missiles simultaneously.

Furthermore, it is impossible to test the whole ABM system completely in combat-simulating conditions. A space-based ABM system should function without a hitch right from the start and cannot operate according to the usual warfare scheme. It should work for decades running without fail, which is not feasible and is fraught with most damaging consequences. What is worse still, in this case there would eventually appear two opposed automated systems in outer space, not coordinated with one another. Normally, such systems should be tested jointly in natural conditions. This would be logical with any civilian international project. But not in this case. The USA would not allow the Soviet Union to adapt its counter-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, p. 422.

measures to the American automated system, nor would the USSR allow the USA to do this with such a system of its own.

A series of studies conducted by the Soviet Scientists for Peace Committee give us every reason to conclude that a few combinations of anti-SDI means would actually rule out a unilateral upsetting of the military strategic parity, and in a cheaper way at that. In one such study the cost of the set of means to counter the SDI is estimated at merely a tiny per cent of the cost of a large-scale anti-ballistic missile system with space-based elements.

Numerous experts and scientists, including American ones, are of the opinion that the much publicised "star wars" programme is both impracticable and inexpedient. The space "shield", as the calculations have shown, cannot be totally impenetrable. Even if it could neutralise 99 per cent of the strikes delivered with the use of the nuclear arsenal accumulated to date, the remaining 1 per cent would be quite enough to paralyse world civilisation.

Yet, the authors and advocates of the SDI advertise this programme—against common sense—as a perfect shield for knocking off Soviet missiles. This is alleged in the press and in daily TV broadcasts, including those meant for children. But these reports and broadcasts, deliberately oversimplified to mislead ignorant people far removed from politics, forget to mention the "sword" and the fact that the SDI would provoke a destabilisation of the strategic situation as a whole.

The introduction by either side, or by both, of yet another new component, such as a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements, would confuse the whole procedure of evaluating the strategic balance and would make it still more difficult to calculate the balance of strength. Besides, the two major nuclear powers would most probably develop these systems each in its own way, as was the case with the strategic offensive arms. This would add to the imbalances in the strategic forces of the sides, making them less comparable. The imbalances may appear still greater, considering possible measures to counter space echelons of an ABM system and also the response to these measures. The adoption of space strike weapons would be dangerous in a situation when nuclear weapons, which would not yet grow "obsolete" and be upgraded, would, together with space weapons, reach a point at which crucial decisions would have to be made entirely by computers and automatic devices. What this can lead to was demonstrated once again by the tragedy of the US spacecraft Challenger on January 28 this year (the spacecraft had been repeatedly tested to the extent possible today). With the SDI the situation would be far worse because its advocates and executors are for the most part representatives of the US military, political and academic quarters who have the most biased, negative ideas with regard to the USSR's intentions and who are most inclined to use armed force in a conflict.

It can be imagined, of course, that some day a system can be created with the help of new types of weapons that would quite effectively hit missiles existing today. But these missiles, too, would be modernised accordingly. An absolute weapon, on which the stake is made today, cannot exist, for scientific and technological progress, which is a creative process, rejects anything absolute. The main thing, however, is that no technology, however perfect, can provide either security, or disarmament, for these are political problems and they cannot be solved by technical means.

Modern weapons don't give any country the chance to protect itself solely by technical military means, even by a most powerful defence system. For this reason reliable security is becoming increasingly a political problem to be solved by political means only. What is needed is the will to ensure security through disarmament. And the complete absence of such will on the US side is, no doubt, abnormal.

From the outset the SDI implied rejecting the coordination of international legal commitments guaranteeing the prevention of an arms race in outer space both at multilateral meetings and on a bilateral basis.

Incidentally, the US Administration displayed opposition to preventing weapon deployment in outer space already before the SDI was launched, in particular, in 1981, when the USSR proposed at the UN the Draft Treaty on the Prohibition of the Stationing of Weapons of Any Kind in Outer Space. In 1983, the USSR went further and proposed that an understanding be reached on a prohibition of the use of armed force in outer space, and also from outer space with regard to Earth, by placing for discussion at the 38th Session of the UN General Assembly a relevant draft treaty. The new draft envisaged a complete ban on the testing and deployment in outer space of any space-based weapons designed for hitting targets on the earth, in the air, or in outer space. On top of that, it suggested a radical solution to the problem of anti-satellite weapons, that is, that the development of new systems of this type should be given up, that existing systems of this kind be scrapped, and that testing and use for military purposes of manned space craft should be altogether prohibited. The USA came out against these Soviet initiatives but failed to block the debate in the United Nations and at the Conference on Disarmament on preventing the arms race from spilling over into outer space. It became obvious that the way the situation was forming at the time could place Washington in isolation on this issue. The US Administration drew no appropriate conclusions and kept ostensibly ignoring a political solution. It did not respond either to the USSR's unilateral commitment, which it assumed in August 1983, not to be the first to orbit in outer space any types of anti-satellite weapons so long as other countries, including the United States, would refrain from doing so. Moreover, the US side did all it could so that Soviet-American talks on preventing the militarisation of outer space, proposed by the Soviet Union to be held starting September 18, 1984, would not be held at all.

As it could well be expected, as a result of the US blunt refusal to have the problem solved through negotiations, the United States was the only country not to back the resolution on preventing the arms race from spilling over into outer space adopted by the 39th Session of the UN General Assembly which had discussed, on the USSR's initiative, the question of using outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes, for the benefit of mankind: 150 states voted for the resolution.

Pressured by the world community, Washington accepted the Soviet proposal on holding new Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms. Most important in this context is that the prevention of an arms race in space is among the goals of the talks agreed upon in January 1985. These talks, which started on March 12, 1985 in Geneva, offered a good chance for freeing mankind of the further arms race escalation and preventing its spread to outer space. In order not to let this chance go by, the USSR, in October 1985, on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting, advanced new constructive proposals aimed at reaching a mutually acceptable agreement as soon as possible.

The US leadership did not agree to give up the "star wars" programme, which prevented a concrete agreement on real disarmament, above all, on the central issue of nuclear and space arms, at the Geneva summit meeting on November 19-21, 1985.

It was agreed at the same time to speed up the talks on nuclear and space weapons, and the January 1985 formula on the goal and subject of the talks was confirmed at the summit level. Besides, the joint Soviet-American statement on the outcome of the meeting stressed for the first time: "Having discussed the key issues of security, the sides, aware of the special responsibility of the USSR and the USA for safeguarding peace, declare that a nuclear war must never be unleashed and that there can be no winners in that war. Admitting that any conflict between the USSR and the USA can have catastrophic consequences, they also stressed the im-

portance of averting any war between them—nuclear or conventional. They will not seek military superiority.”²

The understandings reached prompted this question: if the Soviet Union and the United States have jointly declared the inadmissibility of nuclear war, of any conflict between the USSR and the USA, and of a striving for military superiority, then why the arms race at all and, still more surprising, an arms race in space? Besides, to speed up the talks on nuclear and space arms, they must be conducted more effectively with regard to all such weapons, including space arms. The developments that followed showed that the fanatical drive to get the SDI approved at any cost prevailed over rational political considerations, including those agreed upon by the leaders of both countries in Geneva.

In this situation the Soviet Union came up with the Statement of January 15, 1986 in which it proposed, among other constructive measures, that space strike weapons be banned. During the first stage of the USSR-proposed nuclear disarmament programme the USSR and the USA would cut by half the nuclear arms capable of reaching the territory of each other, while both countries would refrain from developing, testing and deploying space weapons. At the second stage, a Soviet-US agreement on banning space strike weapons would become multilateral, to be necessarily joined by major industrial powers.

The development of space strike weapons, as it was again pointed out by the Soviet Union, will leave no chance for reducing nuclear arms on earth. The USSR has always believed that outer space should be kept peaceful, and no strike weapons should be placed there. Such weapons should not even be developed, and a ban on their development should be monitored most strictly. To that end, corresponding laboratories should be open for inspection.

The Soviet delegation at the current Soviet-American talks in Geneva put forward concrete proposals on the basis of the January 15 Statement. The 27th Congress of the CPSU reaffirmed the USSR's preparedness to solve the issue of medium-range missiles in the European zone separately, not directly in the context of problems related to strategic arms and space.

President Reagan's answer to this Statement has shown that no positive change has occurred in the US stand. The demand that the Soviet Union, instead of working to prevent a space arms race, should agree to an understanding not affecting the implementation of the SDI was again among the numerous “linkages” and “terms”.

The 27th Congress of the CPSU assessed in a principled way the US destructive course in international affairs and again spoke for holding effective, honest and businesslike talks. The new proposal advanced at the Congress envisaged the setting up of a universal system of international security, including measures to prevent an arms race in outer space and to pool efforts in the exploration and peaceful uses of space. These issues were included in the new edition of the CPSU Programme and the Congress's Resolution.

To all appearances, Washington has failed to realise that security, as regards Soviet-US relations, can only be mutual and, viewed in the context of international relations as a whole, it can only be universal. It is significant to note that proposing the SDI, whose implementation would mean a radical change of the NATO doctrine, the US President did not consult his allies.

² *Pravda*. Nov. 22, 1985.

The FRG was among the first to join the "star wars" programme and took a most active part in the series of US measures extremely damaging to the cause of international security, peace and cooperation. One of the first in the series of these actions was the receiving of US medium-range missiles on West German territory. The next step—joining the SDI—was followed by another. The reference here is to Bonn's efforts to give effect to the idea of a "European defence initiative" (EDI). All this clearly reveals the FRG's wish to obtain the more up-to-date military technology and to have a special role to play in charting the NATO strategic line. This drive does not tally with the declarations issued by the Kohl Cabinet in favour of "achieving greater security with less weapons", or with its "adherence to the Ostpolitik" of the FRG.

The SDI sponsors themselves admit now and again that they had set out to solve an equation with many unknown quantities and, what is more, have a fairly vague idea of the end result. But despite all this, they insist that the SDI will render nuclear arms "redundant and obsolete" and will solve the security problem for the USA, and also for the whole world. At this stage it is yet to find out whether the ABM system works at all. When this becomes clear (hardly before 1993 under the current plans), a decision will be made whether to deploy such a system and what should be done about the US-Soviet Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems. Prior to that space weapons are not to be discussed. The SDI should not be "bargained over" during the talks. The sides at the talks should only consider how offensive systems can be replaced with defensive ones. After a large-scale US anti-ballistic missile system with space-based components is built (probably in a few decades), it would be possible, they say, to agree on cutting back, or even eliminating, nuclear arms. During all this period it is for the USA, according to the American scheme, to make the ultimate decision. The belief in the exclusiveness and supremacy of all that is North American, abnormal as it is, develops into pathological chauvinism in security matters in the concept set forth earlier. Only someone lacking common sense can expect that the other great power—the USSR—would sacrifice the interests of its own security and that of its allies and shut its eyes to the aggressive nature of the "star wars" programme.

The SDI is a stake on ensuring security for the USA alone by the superior space "shield"—nuclear "sword" combination. In practice, writes R. Bowman, President of the US Institute for Space and Security Studies in the newspaper *Christian Science Monitor*, the SDI is spearheaded precisely at the strategic weapons which allow the Soviet Union to maintain parity. The Americans, as it were, tell the Soviet Union: "We are tired of this equality business. The only way we can regain our political leverage... is to regain absolute military superiority."³

The goal of the SDI is to make the USA invulnerable and place the USSR in an unprecedentedly vulnerable position; to build a shield against a retaliation strike dealt by Soviet strategic missiles and guarantee the USA the opportunity of delivering a nuclear strike against the Soviet Union from behind that shield with impunity. This approach requires a prior buildup of offensive strategic weapons designed for a most effective first strike, and the USA is speedily developing five new types of strategic missile delivery vehicles and is deploying other nuclear weapons systems.

The planned US anti-missile system is regarded as a first-strike means also because the United States refuses to assume a commitment on refraining from the first use of nuclear arms and keeps building up the first-strike potential. An important element of such policy is the deployment of

³ *The Christian Science Monitor*, Jan. 10, 1985.

US medium-range nuclear missiles, above all Pershing-2 missiles, in Europe.

The US concept of security is, and this is confirmed by the SDI, too, that security should be ensured primarily by military-technical means, in this case with the help of new "superweapons", a technological trick which is believed to help find the way out of the nuclear impasse. But despite the vague assurances about willingness to share the "wonders of technology" with other countries (with the USSR as well) "in due time", the USA wants to get out of the impasse alone in order to achieve absolute security for itself, placing all others in a position of "absolute danger".

The Soviet concept is that of equal security for all on the path towards arms reduction and disarmament, up to a complete elimination of all weapons of mass destruction. In its policy the USSR has always given preference to ideas of collective security based on a thoroughly weighed balance of the interests of all countries. But while previously collective security was just preferable, today, the USSR is firmly convinced, it is the only way. In the nuclear age, the security of states is only possible as security for all. From this point of view, a lower level of security, say, that of the United States as compared with the Soviet Union, would even be disadvantageous to the Soviet Union, for this would mean strategic instability and would therefore stimulate the arms race. The USSR does not have two standards—one for its own security and the other for the rest of the world.

The fact that the US and Soviet concepts are opposites cannot but cause concern, all the more so since security matters should be central at the next Soviet-US summit. The USSR believes that this meeting should yield practical results and mark considerable progress in the directions that are vital for the cause of peace, any other outcome rendering it senseless. The Soviet Union is doing everything possible to that end.

The course of events will largely depend on whether the US Administration comes to realise that it is time to give up the approach which is described in the Soviet Statement of January 15, 1986, as "Stone-Age mentality, the time when the main thing was to get a bigger club and a heavier stone"; that humanity should enter the third millennium not with "star wars" but with large-scale projects of space exploration by the joint efforts of the whole of mankind.

Going over to a qualitatively new level of regulating interstate relations requires a democratisation of all international activities. The degree of democracy of foreign policy in one or another country is gauged by the extent to which its actions on the world scene tally with the standards and the will of the overwhelming majority of the world community, with the strict observance of international law. There is not a grain of foreign-policy democracy in the SDI.

On December 12, 1985, the 40th Session of the UN General Assembly passed a resolution on prevention of an arms race in outer space, which reflected the essence of the Soviet proposal on international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space in the conditions of its non-militarisation. At the Session, 151 delegates voted for the resolution, not a single vote was cast against it; the USA and Grenada abstained. Thus Washington again demonstrated complete disregard for the profound concern caused in the world by the military-political, economic and psychological impact of the SDI implementation.

To this day, Washington has not thoroughly analysed the possible effects of implementing the SDI. Instead, it has been making repeated attempts to mislead public opinion and to push through its "star wars"

programme as soon and as smoothly as possible. Special stress in these attempts is on misinterpreting the true meaning of the understandings underlying the open-ended 1972 Soviet-US Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM). The Treaty says clearly that "effective measures to limit anti-ballistic missile systems would be a substantial factor in curbing the race in strategic offensive arms and would lead to a decrease in the risk of outbreak of war involving nuclear weapons". To that end, both sides committed themselves "not to develop, test or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based." It was not without reason that the treaty banned the deployment of a large-scale ABM system, though its provisions pertained to really defensive weapons systems incapable of delivering strikes at the territory of the other side. The point is that the oversimplified view that defensive weapons were always good had to be discarded. In our day and age, the term "defensive weapons" is not synonymous with a "defence doctrine".

The present US Administration poses the question quite differently, careful to provide some camouflage, however. It motivates the "admissibility" of the SDI by alleging that it does not yet mean the development of space arms, but merely research designed to find out whether it is possible to build such weapon systems.

When the SDI programme was first announced in 1983, its true purpose was disguised that way, but later, for instance in a White House publication on January 3, 1985, referring to the work already done, the purpose of the SDI was formulated not as finding out the possibilities for creating a space-based ABM system but was to determine how this could be done. In the Pentagon documents presented before Congress the work done under the SDI programme was unequivocally placed within the category of "advanced R&D". This goes far beyond the "finding-out" stage, which has, incidentally, been confirmed by the US President himself. He stated frankly in a nationwide TV address in February this year that the Administration was not going to confine itself to "research" related to the "strategic defense initiative" and was planning, already now, to immediately start the development of real space weapons systems. The USA should turn its "superiority" on the laboratory level into superiority in specific armaments, he declared.

The very task of creating a space anti-ballistic missile defence, no matter at what stage, runs counter to the spirit and the letter of the 1972 ABM Treaty.

To confuse this clear matter, reference is sometimes made to the supplement affixed to the ABM Treaty concerning agreed upon statements allegedly allowing the development of ABM systems based on physical principles other than those limited under the Treaty. But since such entirely new means as lasers, particle beam accelerators, and so on, are being developed under the SDI programme, this is alleged not to be in disagreement with the Treaty. True, one of the statements affixed to the Treaty does not rule out the possibility of employing means based on other physical principles. But this possibility is envisaged only for the limited ABM areas permitted under the Treaty, only to stationary ground-based systems.

In the case of the SDI, too, opponents to disarmament again resort to the flyblown verification "issue". Scientific research, they assert, cannot be banned because it is unverifiable and, in general, the flight of human thought cannot be cut short. But the Soviet Union suggests nothing of the kind. Fundamental space research can and must go on for the benefit of man. Yet it is quite possible to prohibit research aimed at the development of space strike weapons and to verify the prohibition effectively. If anyone would venture to sidestep the ban on the development of space strike arms, this would ultimately come out because such development requires extra-laboratory testing, which cannot be conducted covertly.

That the "research aspect" of the SDI is far from being really a research programme but is the first stage of developing a new ABM system banned under the 1972 Treaty is evidenced not only by the scope of the work being done, which is unheard of in the event of pure research, but also by other facts, including the testing of space strike weapons by the United States. As much as \$70,000 million is planned to be earmarked for what is called the research aspect of the SDI, the sum exceeding, in terms of current prices, the expenditures on the programme of developing nuclear weapons by over 300 per cent, and the spending on the Apollo programme which envisaged the development of astronautics for a whole decade, including the landing of a man on the Moon, by 150 per cent. The calculations done by US scientists to estimate the cost of a manned space journey to Mars have shown that its cost would be only a half of what is planned to be spent on the SDI until 1993.

The SDI concept is yet another manifestation of political hypocrisy. Even in Washington's official quarters, as Mikhail Gorbachev put it, there are at least ten cynics per every "believer" in this surrealistic plan of eliminating the nuclear threat under the SDI programme, and what the cynics really have in mind is far from what evidently President Reagan speaks and dreams about. Some of them, for instance, aware that an "impenetrable shield" cannot be built, agree to an anti-missile defence on a smaller scale, which, together with weapons designed for a preemptive strike against the retaliation forces of the other side, would provide possibilities for launching a nuclear attack with impunity. Others just want to line their pockets. And still others want to draw the Soviet Union into a space arms race and thus to hamstring its economy. And still others hope to widen the technological gap between the USA and Western Europe, thereby making Western Europe dependent on the USA. And so on.

The unsound political thinking of SDI advocates is manifest also in the fact that it does not enjoy the support of the majority of the Americans. According to the selective opinion poll carried out by *The New York Times* jointly with the CBS company on the eve of the Soviet-US Geneva summit, 53 per cent of those polled believed the USA should forsake the SDI in favour of arms reduction talks and a mere 33 per cent insisted that the work under the SDI programme be continued.

The policy of all-out confrontation, including military confrontation, which the SDI is geared for, is an escape into the past and not a response to the challenges of the future; it is an act of desperation, but this does not make it less dangerous. When this is realised in Washington, and to what extent, will be seen from practical actions, particularly those designed to prevent the arms race from spilling over to outer space.

The Soviet Union is resolved to continue to do everything in its power to prevent this spillover and to preserve space for peaceful activities. "We believe," Mikhail Gorbachev stressed, "that in this way we express the wish of the overwhelming majority of states, of all who have common sense and a sense of responsibility."⁴

The USA with its military-industrial machine still running at full speed is the locomotive of militarism. This, of course, must be taken into account. But it is commonly known that the interests and goals of the military-industrial complex differ a good deal from those of the American people, from the true national interests of this great country. Like the in-

⁴ *Pravda*, Oct. 4, 1985.

terests of the whole world community, they insistently demand that all should learn to act on the international scene with tact and discretion, and live in a civilised way, that is, in the conditions of correct international intercourse and cooperation. This means that everybody should understand that not only nuclear war but also preparations for it, that is, the arms race, and the striving for military superiority can, objectively speaking, bring political benefits to no one.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English translation COPYRIGHT: Progress Publishers 1986

/9274

CSO: 5200/1526

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

SOVIET JOURNAL ON GORBACHEV 15 JANUARY PROPOSAL

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 7, Jul 86 pp 62-69

[Article by P. Volodarov]

[Text] **T**he programme for achieving world security through disarmament, like all other foreign-policy initiatives launched at the CPSU 27th Congress, has become the focus of world public attention. The new major Soviet initiatives are examined, debated and discussed everywhere. Interest is great, indeed, for the future of mankind is at stake. For the first time an integral, concrete and precisely timetabled programme for making the world safer, for delivering it from nuclear arms, preventing an arms race in outer space, and drastically reducing conventional weapons, has been put forward.

Having carefully analysed the present world situation, having assessed the positions and practical actions of other states, the Congress of Soviet Communists has arrived at the conclusion that in today's world, which is full of contradictions and where many aspects and phenomena have become interdependent due to the nuclear and space realities, it is possible and vitally imperative that the international situation be radically improved, that a new, extremely dangerous and costly round of the arms race be prevented, and that universal security be strengthened.

The struggle against the nuclear danger, the arms race, for preserving and strengthening universal peace, remains the major thrust of the Party's activities in the world arena. Within this framework the central thrust of the USSR's foreign policy will be the activity aimed at implementing the programme advanced by the CPSU Central Committee General Secretary in his statement of January 15, 1986. This programme is based upon the fact that mankind's historical development reached the point when its future existence depends on the path along which it chooses to proceed.

The countries of the world have a choice: either they can continue thinking along old lines, pursuing the arms race and military superiority, or they can reject this, take a critical and unbiased look at the world situation, and pool their efforts to ensure peace and prosperity for the present and coming generations.

The Soviet Union proposes the second variant, for the first one leads to self-destruction.

Apart from being aware of the importance of this moment, one should realise the necessity of ensuring equal security for all nations. Countries can no longer afford to seek security at the expense of others. They should work together to achieve security, for they all are confronted with the common threat of nuclear war.

This conclusion inevitably follows from the realities of the nuclear and space era which has infinitely extended mankind's possibilities and simultaneously compressed the territorial and time indices.

The Soviet Union does not claim that this idea is exclusively its own. The same conclusion has been made by realistically-minded politicians, public figures, scientists and everyone concerned with maintaining peace. This conclusion is formulated in the documents of the non-aligned movement and in the appeals by leaders of the six countries representing different continents.

Life insistently demands that priorities be revised with regard to ways and means of achieving security. Previously the possession of more weapons could protect a state from outside threats, whereas today security cannot be achieved by military-technological means.

New and more sophisticated types of weapons developed to counter, or replace, the existing ones, can no longer give one country advantage over others security-wise, since the existence of new weapons would render the world situation still more unstable and, in the long run, bring about "zero security". The capability and properties of modern weapons make the policy of confrontation senseless. Here are some statistical data to prove this: 3.3 million people died in the wars within the whole of the 17th century, 5.3 million in the 18th century, and 5.6 million between 1801 and 1913. World War I took a toll of 10 million killed and 20 million maimed, and World War II wiped out 50 million human lives. And what would a war result in now with the immense overkill arsenals stockpiled in our world?

In this entirely new situation security can be achieved by political means, through reaching political understanding.

It is therefore impossible to prefer national over international security, or to strengthen one's security at the expense of the security of others.

The Soviet Union is fully aware that a selective approach to security is utopia. As was stressed by Mikhail Gorbachev, in the nuclear age the security of states cannot depend on the use or threat of force. It is possible only as security for all. Lesser security of any country as compared with that of the Soviet Union would not benefit the USSR, since this would be a source of distrust and instability.

Dozens of sovereign countries in the world today have their own interests, ambitions and problems, and to ensure stable general security it is absolutely necessary that the interests of each state be met with due account of the interests of others, through cooperation.

The Soviet Union firmly insists on practical disarmament measures. It takes these measures itself and urges others to follow suit.

In the programme of universal security through disarmament the Soviet Union offers a comprehensive plan for the consideration by the international community of ensuring reliable and just peace. The USSR proposes that peace be built by taking rapid, large-scale steps, so that the world would be free of any mass destruction means by the end of this century. The Soviet Union is against rigid linkage and all types of diplomatic games designed for making up for concessions in one area by putting up obstacles in another one.

The most extensive measure to be implemented in this plan is the programme of complete and general elimination of nuclear arms by the end of this millennium advanced in the January 15 Statement.

The Soviet Union already proposed at the outset of the nuclear era that nuclear arms be removed from the arsenals of states.

This programme is new in that it not merely sets an ultimate goal to be achieved some time in the future, but proposes clear-cut and specific measures to be effected within a historically brief period of fifteen years, as a result of which nuclear weapons would be totally eliminated in the world and simultaneously space strike weapons would be necessarily banned.

Under the programme, at the first stage (5-8 years) the nuclear arms of the USSR and the USA capable of reaching the territory of each other would be cut by half, provided, naturally, that both sides renounce space strike weapons.

A ban on space strike weapons is a natural and logical condition for eliminating nuclear arms in general. Preventing the arms race from spilling over into outer space is tantamount to lifting a barrier to large reductions of nuclear arms and their ultimate stage-by-stage liquidation. This is not an arbitrary linkup of two different matters. There is an objective material relationship between them. As it sets the goal of eliminating nuclear danger, the USSR proposes that simultaneously another and not less disastrous menace, the space one, be eliminated as well. This does not imply a prohibition of fundamental research (including laser development). But if this exceeds the limits of fundamental research and becomes part of arms development, then it must be banned too, of course.¹ If an obligation on refraining from the development of space strike weapons is assumed, it would be easily verifiable. Should any state attempt to violate it, this would become known, for the development of these weapons would involve building models, pilot specimens, and extra-laboratory testing. To prevent this, the Soviet Union has suggested setting up verification laboratories. So, a ban on space strike weapons would automatically solve the research problem.

The implementation of these Soviet proposals would bring the total amount of the nuclear arms of the USSR and the USA to 1,250 and of the delivery vehicles to 1,680 after the first stage provided space strike weapons are banned. The Soviet Union thus agrees to the USA having some advantage in the number of delivery vehicles, considering that after a 50-per cent cut in the nuclear arms delivery vehicles the sides would have an equal number of 6,000 charges each, which will thus ensure approximate strategic equilibrium.

It has, thus, been proposed to reduce strategic offensive arms on the Soviet side and strategic offensive arms and medium-range missiles deployed in Western Europe, carrier-based aircraft, and medium-range carrier (parent) aircraft at the US bases in Europe and Asia on the US side. The Soviet medium-range missiles cannot reach US territory and therefore are not included in the strategic parity formula. As for the reduction of US forward-based weapons, although the USSR found it possible not to include them in SALT-2, it has never dismissed the issue. Their inclusion in the proposed reduction is all the more justified since it is going to be a drastic cut.

An entirely new element in the programme is the bold and far-reaching proposal on medium-range missiles. The Soviet Union has declared its preparedness to sign, already now, a separate agreement with the USA, which would not directly concern strategic arms and outer space issues, on eliminating medium-range missiles in the zone of Europe. On the US side, this would be Pershing-2 ballistic missiles and cruise missiles deployed in Western Europe and on the Soviet side, the medium-range missiles deployed in this zone. It is necessary that the USA stop deliveries of its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries; then it would become impossible to side-step a future reduction agreement.

It is necessary also that Britain and France not build up these types of weapons. In this case the planned delivery of US Tridents to Britain

¹ The "research" conducted in the United States to develop an anti-ballistic missile system with space-based elements is a violation of the Soviet-American 1972 ABM Treaty as it runs counter to the letter and the spirit of this Treaty. This can be compared to a state signatory of a convention on banning and destroying germ weapons announcing a national programme of developing such weapons. This is precisely the case with the Strategic Defence Initiative and the ABM Treaty.

would be prohibited both in keeping with the first provision (non-transfer of such weapons by the United States) and with the second one, as this would sharply increase its nuclear potential (in the number of warheads in submarine-launched ballistic missiles). All the relevant problems could be discussed directly with France and Britain.

It is only natural that if a separate agreement on medium-range missiles in the European zone would be signed, then the reduced US medium-range missiles would be included as part of the future 50-per cent cut in nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory.

The new Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles is, of course, a large-scale and bold measure towards freeing all of the European continent from nuclear arms.

All the proposals put forward earlier by the Soviet Union at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms fit well into the USSR-proposed solution to the medium-range missile issue. This pertains to a possible intermediate decision on medium-range missiles, say, on their partial reduction, for which the Soviet side has expressed preparedness.

It is sometimes alleged in the West that the Europeans feel it makes no difference if the Soviet SS-20 missiles are eliminated only in Europe, for these weapons could be delivered from the Soviet East to the European zone in no time. But the same is true about the US medium-range missiles—Pershing-2 and cruise missiles. It is no secret that they can reach Europe from America even faster. So this kind of reasoning is merely a pretext for avoiding a solution to the problem of eliminating medium-range missiles.

Nonetheless, if additional guarantees are required, the Soviet Union is prepared to sign a separate agreement prohibiting the redeployment of Soviet medium-range missiles from Asian to European regions, provided a reciprocal obligation is assumed by the United States. Such an agreement is verifiable by the available technical means.

As for the missiles in the eastern part of the USSR, they are deployed to balance the American nuclear arms in that region which can reach Soviet territory (carrier-based aviation and nuclear arms carrying aircraft deployed on Guam Island, in the Philippines, Japan, and South Korea). The fewer nuclear weapons counterbalanced by the Soviet missiles, the fewer such missiles remain in the eastern part of the USSR. In the long run, all nuclear means, including those in Asia, would be eliminated under the USSR-proposed nuclear disarmament programme.

That is, the number of Soviet medium-range missiles deployed in the eastern part of the Soviet Union directly depends on the military-strategic situation in the Asian region.

Moreover, the European zone within the boundary proposed by the USSR at the Geneva talks, in particular, its eastern borderline (80° Eastern longitude), would make it impossible for the Soviet SS-20 missiles to reach targets in Western Europe.

It is alleged also that the Soviet Union is going to make up for the loss of its medium-range missiles in the European zone by building up tactical nuclear arms there, because its programme, it is said, envisages no limitations of these weapons at the first stage. The Soviet Union has no such intention, for this would contradict the purpose of its programme of eliminating nuclear weapons. But it is not just intentions that matter here. Tactical nuclear weapons can in no way be a substitute for medium-range missiles. As for the Soviet operative longer range tactical missiles deployed on the territory of the GDR and Czechoslovakia as a response measure, there will be no need for having these missiles there if the cause of their deployment is eliminated, that is, if all US medium-range missiles are removed from Europe.

A specific feature of the new Soviet programme is that it takes into account present-day world realities, and the opinions of other states, including nuclear ones.

The programme fully reflects the special responsibility placed on the Soviet Union and the United States for attaining nuclear disarmament. They will have to be the initiators and start the practical dismantling of the nuclear arsenals.

Naturally, at a certain stage the other nuclear powers, too, will have to join the USSR and the USA.

The British, French and Chinese leaders have said on many occasions that their countries' joining nuclear disarmament efforts must be preceded by substantial cuts in the Soviet and American nuclear arsenals. Even specific figures were named.

Therefore the Soviet Union proposes that these countries begin nuclear arms reduction at the second stage, when the USSR and the USA have reduced—by 50 per cent—their strategic and other nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory. Besides, according to the Soviet programme, the reduction of these countries' nuclear arsenals would begin with tactical weapons, while the nuclear arms they themselves call strategic would be eliminated only at the third stage, simultaneously with the completion of that process by the USSR and the USA. But at the second stage the other nuclear powers would commit themselves to freezing all their nuclear armaments and not deploying them in other countries from where the missiles could reach these powers' territories.

At the second stage the Soviet-American agreement on banning space strike weapons should become multilateral and be necessarily joined by the major industrial powers.

At the third stage, which should start not later than 1995, all nuclear arms on Earth should be eliminated by the end of 1999.

A universal and all-embracing understanding (or understandings) should be elaborated to rule out the possibility of recreating nuclear weapons any time in future. To this end, the international norms of prohibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons should be made universal and nuclear weapons testing should be banned in the atmosphere, in outer space, under water and under the ground.

The proposed nuclear disarmament programme outlines the main directions of limiting and ending the nuclear arms race. In the process of its implementation other measures would, naturally, also be taken, such as cessation of nuclear arms manufacture and ending the production of fissionable materials for arms manufacture.

The Soviet programme of universal security through disarmament has been justly regarded in the world as an alternative to the nuclear threat, the only possible alternative at that. It would be no exaggeration to say that the new Soviet initiatives struck a sympathetic chord in millions of people and revived their hope for the triumph of reason and common sense, the hope that mankind would at last be able to get rid of the fear of nuclear destruction.

If we are to single out the characteristics of the new Soviet moves most often expressed in comments by people of all walks of life and political convictions, it would be their novelty, large scope, and concrete approach. Most political analysts note that all the Soviet proposals on nuclear disarmament have been backed up by far-reaching verification measures reliably ensuring the observance of future agreements.

Our friends in the socialist countries have accepted the proposals as their own cause, as an important contribution to the pursuance of their

common line in the international arena, the line which had been agreed upon at the summit meetings of the socialist countries' leaders in October 1985 in Sofia and in November that year in Prague.

The congresses of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, held in March and April this year, expressed full support to the foreign policy of peace pursued by the CPSU, the course, reaffirmed at the 27th Congress of the CPSU, directed towards ensuring peaceful and constructive work of the Soviet people and the working people in the fraternal socialist countries, and meeting the interests of all nations.

"The USSR's peace programme," said Gustav Husak in the report to the 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, "opens up a unique opportunity before mankind. If the peoples of the world want to enter the third millennium without apprehensions about their future, they should use this historic chance. The CPCz and all people of Czechoslovakia fully support this programme. We shall use the ways and means available to us to help realise this grand peace prospect as effectively as we can."

Addressing the 13th Congress of Bulgarian Communists, Todor Zhivkov emphasised that the Bulgarian Communist Party and socialist Bulgaria would contribute to building up the unity and cohesion of the fraternal socialist countries, and to the joint efforts to eliminate the nuclear threat and improve the European and world affairs.

"The Soviet Union's initiatives in tackling problems of world politics and its large-scale proposals aimed at delivering mankind from all types of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 and creating a universal system of international security, mark the start of a new phase in international development," declared Erich Honecker at the 11th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

Scientists, politicians, public figures, workers, peasants and the youth in socialist countries welcome the Soviet proposals on nuclear disarmament. "It's a long time since I've been with the peace movement," said Wojciech Zukrowski, a well-known Polish writer, chairman of the Union of Polish Writers and deputy to the Polish Sejm (parliament). "As all people who wish to live and work in peace, I have been inspired by the far-reaching Soviet proposals on a complete elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons on the Earth, which were put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev and reaffirmed in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Congress of the CPSU."

The Soviet programme of complete and total elimination of nuclear arms and other means of mass destruction evoked a broad response and interest among the public and in the official quarters of most countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America which are members in the non-aligned movement. There is no state among them today which is not willing to commit itself on the new Soviet peace move. True, the assessments are fairly diverse, but the feelings of hope, satisfaction and support for the bold steps made by the USSR are clearly prevalent.

Below is a review of most typical responses in the Asian, African and Latin American countries to these initiatives.

Prime Minister of India, Rajiv Gandhi: the Soviet programme is an alternative to nuclear armament in outer space. It indicates the way of freeing the Earth from nuclear arms.

President of Argentina Raúl Alfonsín: the new Soviet peace initiative is a positive step. It opens up new opportunities for stepping up the struggle for world peace.

Socorro Diaz, chairman of the ideological commission of the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party of Mexico: "The Soviet stance on the

preservation of world peace gives all nations hope that the struggle against a nuclear conflagration will be a success."

The young developing states stress that the new Soviet peace proposals, if implemented, would make it possible not only to strengthen security for all but would offer an opportunity for eliminating famine, diseases and economic backwardness.

The response from the official quarters of the NATO countries has been just as symptomatic, all the more so since Washington, in the opinion of the French newspaper *Le Quotidien de Paris*, hastened to warn these countries immediately after the Soviet Statement was issued, against "making open statements on the Soviet proposals".

Prime Minister of Greece, Andreas Papandreou, said: "The USSR's bold and original proposals, aimed at protecting life on our planet, offer a practical plan of eliminating all types of mass destruction weapons." In the opinion of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the USSR's proposals contain interesting and new elements concerning, in particular, such problems as verification and reduction of medium-range missiles. The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a statement saying that its government positively regarded the Soviet proposals on eliminating nuclear weapons in the world by the year 2000.

Meanwhile in the West, specifically in the United States, a campaign has been launched which is obviously meant to belittle the significance of the Soviet proposals and find flaws in them that allegedly infringe on the interests of the West. The campaigners do not even stop at distorting the meaning of some of the Soviet proposals.

As for official response, this time the Western governments, aware of the public view in their countries, did not venture to dismiss the Soviet proposals outright, as they used to do in the past. First they pretended to be studying the proposals carefully, conducting diplomatic work to coordinate their positions. Then they set out to drown the new Soviet initiatives in debate on technicalities, provoking doubts in the feasibility of the Soviet proposals.

The United States is clearly dodging this issue. On the one hand, it admits that the elimination of nuclear arms is the goal which all nuclear states should seek to attain and, on the whole, seems to agree with various Soviet proposals concerning disarmament and security. It has even voiced some encouraging views. But these views are dissolved in the host of reservations, linkages and terms which, in fact, block the solution of some key disarmament problems. A reduction of strategic nuclear arsenals is made conditional on the USSR's agreeing to the "star wars" programme and to unilateral cuts in Soviet conventional weapons. The refusal to stop nuclear tests is being justified by allegations that such tests are necessary so long as nuclear weapons remain a "containing" factor. This runs counter to the Washington-confirmed goal of eliminating nuclear arms. It is over the issue of nuclear explosions, whose termination is demanded by the whole world, that the unwillingness of the US ruling forces to take the path of nuclear disarmament is most clearly manifest.

As for the Soviet Union, it is a consistent advocate of ceasing all nuclear tests. Mikhail Gorbachev said over Soviet TV on May 14, 1986 that "the Soviet government, having appraised all the circumstances involved in providing security for its people and the entire human race, has taken the decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until August 6 this year, that is the date the first A bomb was dropped on Hiroshima more than forty years ago".

By extending its unilateral moratorium for the third time the USSR thereby once again appealed to the United States to evaluate with all responsibility the extent of the danger hanging over mankind and to take into account the opinion of the world community.

Washington shows no intention of really getting down to solving the cardinal problems of eliminating the nuclear threat and, in actual fact, sticks to its old positions on all matters taken up in the Soviet proposals.

It did, however, attempt to pretend it had come up with "new" ideas on medium-range missiles in Europe, the issue on which the Soviet proposal accords to some extent with the previous US judgements on that score. But these "new" ideas boil down to reproducing the old "zero option" which is not different just because it is suggested to be carried out under a "three-stage plan". As before, this option is aimed at eliminating all Soviet medium-range missiles not only in Europe but also in Asia. On top of that, it is demanded that a "global ceiling" be set at each reduction stage for the number of Soviet and American warheads, which means the USA would have the "right" to have medium-range missiles, at least, also on its own territory. The USA linked the reduction of medium-range missiles with simultaneous limitations of missiles with a range shorter than medium range. The US formula still envisages no limitations for the British and French nuclear missiles. It also says nothing about the United States' assuming an obligation not to transfer its missiles, strategic and medium-range, to other countries. So, as regards medium-range missiles, too, the US answer shows Washington's unwillingness to achieve a radical and fair solution of this problem with regard to Europe where all the necessary opportunities can be provided for this purpose thanks to the Soviet initiatives.

Official quarters in the West have made repeated attempts of late to make arms limitation conditional on the settlement of regional conflicts. This ploy is not at all new. It was used by Western diplomacy to block disarmament efforts way back in the 1930s and after the war. It is quite obvious that this artificial linkage torpedoes the solution of both disarmament problems and regional issues.

An understanding on curbing the arms race and achieving disarmament would offer the main channels along which universal security could be strengthened and military confrontation decreased. By eliminating the means of warfare, the states would create real opportunities for ensuring peace and security.

However, one should not overlook the fact that the conflicts erupting now and again in various parts of the world may grow into an all-out war and therefore practical steps must be made to settle them by joint efforts, through negotiations, with independence and the right of nations to self-determination fully respected.

The Soviet Union is all for urgent actions to eliminate the threat of war and effect disarmament. It has proposed that 1986, declared to be the International Year of Peace by the United Nations, become the year of all-out offensive on the means of warfare in all directions. The Soviet Union can cope with any arms race, if forced to do so. But we say frankly we do not want it.

We do not want it because we know that no one's security, including ours, will benefit from the arms race. We do not want it also because the Soviet people have quite different priorities, which are to speed up in every way the economic, scientific, social and cultural advancement for the good of man. It is namely these ideas which underlie the Soviet proposals on disarmament and our long-term course of making the world safe to live in. This course has been clearly formulated in the documents adopted at the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is an expression of the will of the Party and of all Soviet people.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English translation copyright; Progress Publishers 1986

/9274

CSO: 5200/1526

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET UN ASSOCIATION ISSUES STATEMENT ON NUCLEAR TEST MORATORIUM

PM311316 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "For the Termination of Nuclear Tests"]

[Text] The UN Assistance Association in the USSR has come out with a statement in which it notes that the unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts announced by the USSR had been extended, on numerous demands from the international public, till 6 August 1986. The Soviet leadership addressed the American Administration with an appeal for a positive reply to its initiative and came out for the United States and other nuclear countries halting nuclear tests. This would create favorable conditions for concluding an international treaty on the complete and universal ban of testing and producing nuclear weapons, as it had been not once stipulated by UN decisions.

However, the document says, almost a year has passed but the USSR has not received a positive answer to its initiative either from the United States or from other Western states; moreover, the United States has refused to support the Soviet initiative and is intensely continuing testing new and new kinds of nuclear arms. Since the Soviet moratorium was announced, 15 nuclear blasts have been carried out in the American state of Nevada. The testing of nuclear warheads that is being continued in the United States is undermining the stability of the strategic balance and may result in consequences dangerous for mankind. The Soviet Association for UN Assistance has insistently called on U.S. President Reagan, on behalf of the Soviet public, to follow, before too late, the USSR example and to announce a moratorium on nuclear blasts. Such a step by the U.S. Administration could no doubt help to improve the international climate and to create the conditions necessary for the reduction and subsequent destruction of nuclear weapons arsenals.

The Association has addressed the American Association for UN Assistance with an appeal to urge their government to undertake immediate steps for halting all kinds of nuclear tests and to join the moratorium declared by the Soviet Government.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1517

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: COMMENTARIES ON ANNIVERSARY OF UNILATERAL TEST MORATORIUM

U.S. Rejection 'Shortsighted'

PM011330 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 86 First Edition p 5

[Article by PRAVDA political observer Vitaliy Korionov: "A New Way of Thinking and Acting"]

[Text] One year ago, on 30 July 1985, the news of CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's statement swept around the world. [paragraph continues]

"Desiring to contribute to the cessation of dangerous competition in building up nuclear arsenals and wishing to set a good example," the document said, "the Soviet Union has decided to unilaterally halt all nuclear explosions as of 6 August this year. We call upon the U.S. Government to halt its nuclear explosions on the same date, which is being celebrated worldwide as the day of the Hiroshima tragedy."

In an effort to promote a solution to the problem the Soviet Union has extended the moratorium on three occasions in the past year. The world has welcomed this act of political courage. The socialist community countries saw this peace initiative as one of vital concern to them, it was actively supported by the countries of the "Delhi six" and other peace-loving states, and it met with the approval of hundreds of millions of people of goodwill everywhere.

Only in official Washington circles was the USSR's noble initiative not appreciated. The ground has shaken 15 times in the past year at the Nevada test site. These are 15 new blows to peoples' aspirations.

The two opposing trends in world political life have clashed once again. Moscow is persistently calling for the renunciation of the ideas of war and of the role of weapons that have been present in human consciousness for centuries and for a new look at the realities of the nuclear age.

For ages the belief was that war was an effective means of resolving disputes between states and the one with superior weapons and military equipment won. New and increasingly awful bloodbaths were perpetrated and more and more people perished in the flames of war, but there was no threat to the existence of the human race. The atom bomb changed all that. There can be no victor in a nuclear war, and no military technical "marvel," no "star wars" weapon can guarantee states' security. There is only one solution: The exclusion of wars from the life of society, peaceful coexistence, and collective security.

Mankind resolutely supports the program for the elimination of nuclear, chemical, and other mass destruction weapons put forward in the 15 January 1986 Soviet statement and confirmed by the 27th CPSU Congress, because it sees the program as a realistic way of ensuring genuine, guaranteed security. Socialism has once again confirmed that the new social system is characterized not only by an awareness of the historical realities but by an ability to draw conclusions from these realities that meet mankind's vital interests.

The fact that all thinking forces in the world are actively backing the Soviet program for a nuclear-free world shows that conditions in the world are now right for the formation of a fundamentally new attitude. There is a growing awareness that the old political thinking is a barrier on the path to a world without wars. To discard these obsolete attitudes is to make a decisive leap forward in the matter of solving the problems on which the fate of world civilization depends.

The first step on this road is to halt nuclear tests. After all, each new explosion whips up the nuclear arms race and makes nuclear arms increasingly lethal as far as life on earth is concerned. In view of this, the Soviet Union has been waging a persistent and consistent struggle to halt the buildup of nuclear arsenals ever since the nuclear era began.

Back on 10 May 1955, the USSR stated: One of the paramount measures in the implementation of the program for the reduction of armaments, prohibition of atomic weapons, and elimination of the threat of a new war is the halting of tests of these types of weapons. [paragraph continues]

The persistent efforts were not wasted: In the summer of 1963 during talks in Moscow, representatives of the USSR, the United States, and Britain elaborated an agreement on halting nuclear tests in the three environments. In subsequent years the USSR made a persistent effort to achieve an agreement on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests.

The end was in sight, but by then forces had gained the upper hand in the United States whose policy was an unbridled arms race. "The Pentagon," the U.S. magazine BULLETIN OF ATOMIC SCIENTISTS noted, "is planning over the next 6 years to develop and produce around 17,000 new nuclear weapons. For that reason the U.S. President gave the order in 1982 to increase the number of nuclear tests and terminate future U.S. involvement in tripartite talks with Britain and the Soviet Union on banning tests."

On 27 May, the White House proclaimed: "The United States must now look to the future and not keep glancing back at the past." What kind of future does the White House see? According to U.S. press reports, the administration is planning to conduct around 1,000 underground nuclear explosions in the next decade to develop [razrabotka] "star wars" technology. Of course, within the framework of this kind of policy it is difficult to find a place for a moratorium.

The other day a meeting began in Geneva, on the USSR's initiative, between Soviet and U.S. experts on the question of halting nuclear tests. As soon as the work began some strange statements were issued from Washington. A White House spokesman announced: From the U.S. viewpoint, at the present stage a complete and general test ban is only a "long-term goal." If the Russians, the spokesman said, insist on complete nuclear test ban "they will get a categorical refusal from the United States."

Are there objective reasons for indefinitely postponing the complete cessation of nuclear tests? Hitherto U.S. politicians have tried to justify their reluctance to embark on constructive talks by referring to the lack of refined methods of recording underground nuclear explosions. But now a joint Soviet-American experiment conducted by scientists in the Semipalatinsk area has proved to anyone who still had any doubts: Modern technical facilities possessed by the USSR and the United States make it entirely possible to effectively monitor observance of a nuclear test moratorium.

The USSR is doing its utmost to clear the way to a solution of the question that worry people, demonstrating by practical actions that it is guided by a new way of thinking that meets the demands of the nuclear age. On the other hand, by continuing to poison the international political atmosphere with their explosions at the Nevada test site, the U.S. ruling circles are confirming that they are still reluctant to part with yesterday's philosophy. The vital interests of mankind make it imperative to abandon this shortsighted and dangerous stance.

U.S. Arrogance Noted

PM011334 London MORNING STAR in English 1 Aug 86 p 4

[APN correspondent Marat Zubko "Briefing" article: "World Waits for U.S."]

[Text] The latest Soviet moratorium on nuclear weapons tests expires on August 6.

For a whole year the Soviet Union has not staged any explosions, persistently inviting the United States to follow its example. Now everyone is naturally asking the question: what next?

So far the U.S. is sticking to its old course. Last week it carried out another nuclear test in Nevada, the seventh officially announced this year and the fourteenth since the imposition of the unilateral Soviet moratorium. One gets the impression that the latest explosion in Nevada was particularly arrogant. Just a few days before the test, Soviet and U.S. scientists started implementing their agreement on joint studies into the methods of verification of nuclear explosions.

At a site in Kazakhstan close to the Soviet test range near Semipalatinsk, they deployed the "first seismic registration station." It is fitted out with advanced U.S. equipment and extra-sensitive instruments. It has taken five AN-2 planes to deliver all the necessary equipment to the site. The station is staffed not only with Soviet but also U.S. experts. In the meantime, specialists are selecting the sites for two other stations in the Soviet Union.

If everything goes according to plan, similar stations will be set up in the United States. One would think that the opponents of a nuclear test ban and, consequently, of putting an end to the arms race, have been deprived of one of their main trump cards. They have always claimed that the Soviet Union will never to for the establishment of strict international control over nuclear explosions.

But now, without waiting for an intergovernmental Soviet-U.S. agreement on this score, the Soviet authorities have allowed U.S. seismologists into Kazakhstan.

"I think that we have fully smashed the arguments of the White House that a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty is allegedly impossible and cannot be totally verifiable," said Tom Cochran, chief geophysicist for seismographs of the U.S. Natural Resources

Defense Council, who took part in the installation of the equipment in Kazakhstan. "Everything is quiet underground in the USSR," read the seismographs of the Soviet-U.S. station in Kazakhstan.

The same station, however, clearly registered the latest nuclear explosion in Nevada. After that James Bruin of the University of California in San Diego, who was also present at the site in Kazakhstan, said: "Today I have made sure once again of what I was convinced as a specialist -- the problem of nuclear test verification does not exist."

Now what about Washington? U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle has called the work of the U.S. scientists in Kazakhstan "absurd," thereby making it clear that the point is not the effectiveness of verification but the U.S. refusal to stop the arms race. In this connection I would like to turn to the well-known argument about the supposedly "equal responsibility" of the Soviet Union and the U.S. for the situation in the world. I am deeply convinced that this argument is essentially wrong.

The two countries pursue different policies in the international arena -- notably, on such issues as the arms race and disarmament, the use of space for military or peaceful purposes, the establishment of nuclear-free zones, the prohibition or modernisation of chemical weapons and so on. It would be good to sort out who is the initiator of each new spiral of the arms race and who is simply forced to join it in the interests of its own security.

The case of the year-long Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests and of the actions by the U.S. which has carried out as many as 14 nuclear explosions over this period gives what I think is a clear answer to this question. Will the U.S. exploit the opportunity for saying "yes" to the Soviet-proposed moratorium?

If that happened, that would be a reply meeting the interests and expectations of the whole of humanity.

Repeated Extensions Noted

LD051001 Moscow TASS in English 0936 GMT 5 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 5 TASS -- A year ago, on August 6, the Soviet Union announced the introduction of a voluntary moratorium on all types of nuclear explosions.

Grigoriy Oganov, political observer of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA KULTURA wrote in the newspaper today: "We prolonged the moratorium several times, trying to create in this way more favourable conditions for the successful holding of talks on a whole package of military-strategic problems and each time we urged to follow our example. The termination of nuclear weapons tests would be the beginning of its steady elimination, and this is what humanity is dreaming of."

People in all parts of the world demand today that other countries follow the example of the USSR. The voice of scientists is especially prominent. Ivan Laptev, head of the environmental protection department of Tomsk University, Siberia, said in a TASS interview: "We believe that no task is more urgent, responsible and noble today than the continuation of the moratorium on any nuclear explosions introduced a year ago by the Soviet Union. The moratorium should be spread in an obligatory way to all the nuclear powers and primarily the United States. The courageous and, I should say,

selfless step of the Soviet Government which unilaterally committed itself to observing the moratorium was understood and welcomed by outstanding scientists the world over, including the U.S. It cannot be otherwise. I am a veteran of World War II and I remember with what enthusiasm we made friends with American soldiers who contributed to the struggle against fascism. At that time we believed wholeheartedly that there would be no recurrence of a war on our planet. We believed in the same way in the unbreakable friendship between the allies which was sealed with blood.

"This is why we are indignant over the inflexible stance of the U.S. Administration and the military-industrial complex although it is camouflaged by vague words about self-defense, peace and the balance of forces".

'Shutting Off Arms Race'

PM071451 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[Article by own political observers Vsevolod Ovchinnikov: "A Day of Grief, a Day of Hope"]

[Excerpts] If the deadlock of the nuclear disarmament process is to be broken, it is necessary to start with the simplest and most accessible steps. Banning all nuclear explosions is the easiest way of shutting off the motor of the nuclear arms race in its most dangerous area, since the creation of new kinds of nuclear weapons and the improvement of existing ones would then cease automatically. [paragraph continues]

While at the same time a process of gradual and steady withering away of the arsenals stockpiled by each side would take place. And, finally, mankind would be rid of the side effects of nuclear explosions, which cause grave, albeit not yet fully studied harm to nature.

That is why the Soviet Union marked the 40th anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy with a bold initiative: From 6 August until the end of the year it unilaterally ended all nuclear explosions, whether for military or peaceful purposes. The results of the meeting between the USSR and U.S. leaders in Geneva, where encouraging joint statements were made on the impermissibility of nuclear war, prompted the Soviet Union to make a further good-will move, extending its unilateral moratorium through 31 March this year. In February the authors of the Delhi Declaration -- the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden -- made an urgent appeal for restraint from nuclear explosions until the new Soviet-American summit was held. Opposed in Washington, Moscow responded to this appeal in the affirmative.

The Soviet moratorium was a new step taken along a long road. The Soviet Union proposed a complete nuclear test ban as early as 1955, soon after Japanese fishermen suffered the aftereffects of the American thermonuclear explosion carried out on Bikini Atoll. [passage omitted]

In 1963, the treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water was signed in Moscow. It was the first major step toward curbing the nuclear race and blocked off the most dangerous sources of radioactive contamination of the environment.

The 1974 Soviet-American treaty banning underground explosions with a yield of over 150 kilotons could have taken a future step toward completely ending nuclear tests.

Another Soviet-American treaty, signed 2 years later, also limited the yield of explosions carried out for peaceful purposes and prevents their being used to improve nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, neither of these treaties was to enter into force, as a result of the American side dragging out their ratification by every kind of far-fetched pretext.

In 1977, once again on our country's initiative, the USSR, the United States, and Britain began drafting a treaty on a complete and general ban on nuclear weapons tests. After 3 years they managed to reach virtually complete agreement on the text of the treaty and appendixes. But in 1980, when the opportunity of signing the document was close, the United States refused to continue the talks. The Soviet Union has repeatedly offered to renew the talks -- bilaterally; trilaterally, with British participation; or multilaterally, as part of the Geneva Disarmament Conference. We are also ready to extend the 1963 treaty to cover underground tests of nuclear weapons, as urged by the 40th session of the UN General Assembly.

What about Washington? As a White House official spokesman stated the other day, a treaty completely banning nuclear tests "remains a long-term U.S. goal." But he explained that Washington will deem it appropriate only when the need for means of deterrence disappears, nuclear arsenals have been radically reduced, means of monitoring [proverka] considerably improved, and mutual trust (which, according to the latest formulation, means a change in Soviet domestic policy) strengthened. But an official State Department spokesman did not consider it necessary to heap a series of prior conditions and was much more frank. "The duration of the Soviet moratorium," he said, "depends on the Soviet Union itself. As for the United States, we do not consider a moratorium to be in our security."

Washington contends that the United States cannot join the moratorium, because the USSR is ahead of it in the development [razrabotka] and modernization of nuclear combat munitions.

However, first, it is common knowledge that the USSR has had to catch up to the United States at every phase of the nuclear race; and, second, the figures show that the United States has carried out more nuclear explosions than all the other nuclear powers combined.

There are no sensible arguments against ending nuclear tests. The American side's claims that there are verification [kontrol] difficulties are untenable. Both sides possess adequate national technical means for this. The USSR has repeatedly stated that international forms of monitoring [proverka], right up to on-site inspection [inspektsiya], are acceptable provided that the complete renunciation of nuclear explosions rather than the use of observers to legalize them will be monitored [kontrolirovat].

The International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban held meetings in Moscow this summer. Its participants gave specific examples of joint verification [kontrol] carried out by Soviet and American scientists to ensure nuclear explosions were not held. By agreement between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council, seismic recording centers are to be located in Kazakhstan and Nevada. But by an irony of fate, as it were, the American specialists present near the Soviet test range were only able to record explosions in Nevada -- the 14th and 15th explosions since the Soviet moratorium began.

The silence at the Soviet test ranges demonstrates more convincingly than any words that the new political thinking in the Soviet Union is an objective reality. This also increases the scope of reason and goodwill in the world community. Virtually every country in the United Nations, except the United States, Britain, and France, has voted in favor of immediately ending nuclear tests. Although, as polls show, 56 percent of Americans and 84 percent of Britons favor joining the Soviet moratorium. This is also what is being advocated by the authors of the Delhi Declaration, who timed their meeting in Mexico to coincide with the anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy.

The attitude adopted toward nuclear tests now serves as a kind of touchstone against which states' policy is gauged: Those that strive to eliminate nuclear weapons demand a complete end to explosions, whereas those who cling to such weapons want the tests to continue.

"It is now more important than ever before," M.S. Gorbachev said in Vladivostok, "that we galvanize the potential of commonsense and the partnership of reason to arrest the slide toward catastrophe. Our resolve to do everything within our powers to achieve that is immutable."

This resolve is an inspiration to peace campaigners in all countries and boosts the hope that the threat of a nuclear apocalypse will forever vanish from the horizon and that mankind will enter the 21st century, firm in the knowledge that the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki will never recur.

World Opinion Demands Ban

PM061154 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Aug 86 First Edition p 5

[Vladimir Katin "International Review": "The Moratorium: 1 Year On"]

[Text] The moratorium on nuclear explosions unilaterally adopted by our country has been in effect exactly 1 year. It was originally proclaimed through 1 January 1986 but was subsequently extended twice, and in May of this year our government decided not to conduct nuclear tests through 6 August. That is, until the date on which the United States dropped the first atom bomb on the Japanese city of Hiroshima 41 years ago -- which entailed the deaths of hundreds of thousands of people.

In response to the ending of all nuclear tests, which the Soviet Union announced 1 year ago, the United States began putting forward reasons for refusing to follow that example. At first Washington declared that the Soviet Union always suspends its tests during the summer and fall. When our moratorium was extended by a 7 months, another argument was advanced on the other side of the ocean. The USSR had allegedly carried out more explosions, overtaking the United States in that respect. The Swedish Defense Institute provides information: As of 1 January 1986, 801 devices had been exploded on the U.S. nuclear range, and 563 on the Soviet one.

These figures have become the property of the world public, and you cannot take exception to them. Then the American Administration grasped at a new version -- about the supposed impossibility of verifying [kontrol] nuclear tests. That fabrication was also refuted, it was refuted by venerable scientists from 35 countries, including the United States itself. Here is their opinion, expressed in a special declaration: Regarding the problem of verifying [kontrol] a total nuclear test ban, we are convinced that the latest achievements in the sphere of seismology in conjunction with

corresponding jointly observed international procedures, including on-site inspection [inspektsiya], will ensure a high degree of confidence that nuclear tests are no longer being conducted."

Cooperation between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council is a noteworthy event in the sphere of verification [kontrol]. Under an agreement between them, seismic stations are being set up in the region of Semipalatinsk in Kazakhstan, where the Soviet range is, and in Nevada. One of the purposes of the experiment is to carry out joint verification [kontrol] and to draw up methods for infallibly identifying nuclear explosions.

Yes, Moscow, which, incidentally, is no less interested than the United States in effective verification [kontrol], is moving toward Washington. This cannot be said of the United States. The reason for this is well-known -- to achieve superiority in nuclear arms. As Defense Secretary C. Weinberger admits, the United States is seeking to ensure its "strategic superiority in a nuclear conflict." In other words, the 15 nuclear explosions that thundered in Nevada during the Soviet moratorium constitute real preparations for nuclear war. During the next 10 years the American Administration plans to conduct approximately 1,000 underground nuclear tests for the purpose of developing [razrabotka] technology for waging "star wars".

The attitude toward the problem of nuclear tests is the litmus test of the true intentions of states and their leaders to end the arms race. All Western leaders appear verbally to advocate slowing it down and halting this race. However, as soon as practical actions are demanded, the political will completely disappears and excuses are invented to go back on their word. This is how not only the United States, but also other Western powers behave.

You do not have to be a specialist in military matters to realize that tests are an accelerator of the nuclear arms race because they are used to develop [otrabotka] new kinds and types of mass destruction weapons and to improve existing systems. An end to tests would abruptly slow down this entire process.

What is more, the ending of tests is also the way to eliminate nuclear arsenals already accumulated. For if there are no tests and, consequently, no modernization of the existing nuclear weapons, they will begin gradually to lose their efficiency and grow old and will ultimately die off.

In a word, if we succeed in reaching an agreement on this question, this in turn will mean getting closer in practice to nuclear disarmament. There is nothing unreal about this because the Moscow Treaty, concluded in 1963, on the prohibition of tests in three environments -- in the atmosphere, in space, and under water -- is still operating efficiently. The main issue in the present situation is to realize that all earthly civilization will perish in a nuclear war and that no underground shelters will save it. Only the path to the nuclear-free future can save mankind. This must become the axiom of our age.

The situation has taken shape in such a way that, if we do not lower the barrier in front of the crazy nuclear arms race today, tomorrow may be too late. The world's peoples and the broad public in the West well understand this danger. This was why our unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions was perceived as manifestation of goodwill and as a desire to really prevent mankind from sliding toward the nuclear abyss.

Our country's leadership understands the concern of the people and governments of various countries at the nuclear threat hanging over mankind. As is known, last fall

the leaders of six states -- Argentina, Mexico, Sweden, India, Tanzania, and Greece -- sent M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, a message proposing that the USSR and the United States announce a 12-month moratorium on nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union shares the six countries' leaders' assessment of such a measure as effective in strengthening peace. The Soviet leader pointed out in his reply message: "It is with good reason that you link the ending of tests with hopes of erecting a reliable barrier in the way of the nuclear arms race and with a shift toward the practical elimination of nuclear weapons."

As the past 12 months have shown, the USSR has done everything in its power in this regard. Obviously the time has come to show greater exactingness toward the United States and to influence it on the moral plane. This question will probably be discussed at the meeting of the "Delhi Six," which opened in Mexico on 6 August. Indeed, it is impossible to overlook the fact when Washington ostentatiously ignores the opinion of six influential states and, virtually, of all countries and people.

Incidentally, the proposal of the "Delhi Six" to set up an international seismic center will also help to solve the problem of verification [kontrol], about which the United States is so concerned. This will cut the ground from under those who are inclined to cast doubt on the data obtained by national seismic stations. It has been scientifically established that nuclear explosions with a yield of merely 20-30 metric tons can be reliably recorded at a distance of 2,000-3,000 km, while a 1-kiloton explosion is detectable at a distance of 10,000 km. So, virtually any underground nuclear test can be recorded by the stations the six states, located in different parts of the world, propose to set up and site on their own territories.

The year of the Soviet moratorium has also proved very noteworthy in the sense that it has shown the attitude of the broad world public to nuclear tests. In all parts of the world, including the United States, millions of people; political parties; public organizations; influential individuals; and popular figures in science, culture, and the clergy have sided with us in this matter. This has highlighted the isolation of the American Administration, which explodes one nuclear device after another in Nevada with maniacal stubbornness.

According to public opinion polls, two-thirds of U.S. citizens insist on an immediate end to nuclear tests. More than 100 local organs of power in U.S. states, districts, and cities, including such major cities as New York, Detroit, and Chicago, have adopted resolutions calling on the White House to subscribe to the Soviet moratorium.

Today the world is faced with a merciless reality: Human civilization will not survive a nuclear war. The most sophisticated technological systems can go unexpectedly and catastrophically wrong. The tragic events involving Challenger and at Chernobyl have convincingly demonstrated this recently. Active measures are needed to reduce the risk of nuclear war. And a verifiable [poddayushchiysya proverk] total nuclear test ban could be the first step on this path. In the long term a total, verifiable [poddayushchiysya proverke] test ban would be the prelude to the destruction of all nuclear arsenals. The people of our planet can and must channel their knowledge, experience, and resources elsewhere -- into the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Yes, truly great tasks are being advanced. New thinking is needed to achieve these tasks. The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests is a concrete manifestation of this new thinking, opening up unique opportunities for a total nuclear test ban. It is now up to United States, and people in our country still hope that common sense will prevail on the other side of the ocean.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1517

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S KAPITSA: MORATORIUM EXTENSION DECISION DUE SHORTLY

LD060901 Moscow TASS in English 0856 GMT 6 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 6 TASS -- "Many statesmen and political figures of foreign countries have addressed and are addressing the Soviet Government in connection with the question of an extension of the unilateral moratorium on any nuclear tests.

"This question will be considered with due regard for these addresses and for how much, in our evaluation, the United States is seriously prepared to negotiate an end to nuclear tests", stated Mikhail Kapitsa, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR. He spoke at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists today at the Press Centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In answer to the question when a decision on this matter will be announced, Mikhail Kapitsa stated that that would be done "within the next few days".

/12858

CSO: 5200/1517

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: COMMENTS ON GORBACHEV MORATORIUM EXTENSION ANNOUNCEMENT

U.S. 'Hastened' To Reject Appeal

LD190931 Moscow World Service in English 0900 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] The United States Administration has hastened to reject another call for joining the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear tests. The spokesman for the White House's State Department [as heard] announced unanimously that a stop to nuclear weapons tests would not be in the interests of the United States and its allies. White House Spokesman Larry Speakes admitted publicly that the United States needed further tests to modernize its nuclear arsenals. The nuclear blasts conducted by the United States recently were linked with the implementation of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative known as the "star wars" program.

Foreign Ministry Press Briefing

LD191332 Moscow TASS in English 1324 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 19 TASS — The ending of nuclear tests is the link in the chain by pulling which we can resolve the problem of reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, said today in his comments on the Soviet Union's extension of its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear testing to January 1, 1987. He addressed Soviet and foreign journalists at a briefing in the Press Centre of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

The reaction to the latest peace initiative of the Soviet Union on the other side of the ocean is one of clear disappointment with Moscow's refusal to "play Washington's game" and resume nuclear testing.

American officials characterised the Soviet Union's decision as "propaganda". Yet it is a manifestation of both common sense and a new thinking. The Soviet side will sustain some military and economic losses as a result but we believe, Gerasimov said, that ways should be looked for to terminate the arms race -- he who raises the nuclear sword will die by it, and it is a crime not to reckon with this fact.

Soviet foreign policy is based on awareness of deep-going change in the world. The American side clearly lacks such awareness.

It is coming up with far-fetched arguments against ending nuclear tests, in particular, difficulties of verification. Apparently, there is nothing vague in that area, especially after the Soviet Union has not only agreed to on-site inspection technically but taken a practical step and allowed American scientists to bring their seismic equipment to the area of Semipalatinsk. The point is not verification but the unwillingness of the USA to stop the arms race.

The Soviet side agreed to extend the moratorium in the hope that Washington will again evaluate the situation without bias, cast aside everything irrelevant and join the Soviet moratorium, which will eventually make it possible to reach an agreement on a nuclear test ban.

Prague TV Version

LD192211 Prague Television Service in Czech 2000 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Czechoslovak Television correspondent Jiri Vitous took part today in the press conference with Gennadiy Gerasimov, Chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Information Department, and asked the following question:

[Begin recording in Russian fading into Czech translation] [Vitous] The West German daily DIE WELT recently carried an interview with U.S. President Reagan. When they spoke about the reply to the June proposal of Mikhail Gorbachev, he said that it is constructive. Today we hear, however, that Larry Speakes, White House press spokesman, reacted to yesterday's declaration of Mikhail Gorbachev -- a declaration that cannot be rejected by a sensible man, and even less by a responsible state official -- in a spirit that cannot be called constructive. What is Moscow's view of this constructive approach?

[Gerasimov] So far we really see nothing constructive in this stance. The only thing that we can say about the initial reaction to Mikhail Gorbachev's declaration is that it is disappointing. I think, we have to complete the picture with the recent allegations of U.S. representatives, or, to put it better, of U.S. official bodies, to the effect that the USSR is planning to resume its nuclear tests. They even prompted us to resume tests because it would of course suit the U.S. military-industrial complex above all. I repeat yet again that the U.S. reaction to the proposal to prolong the moratorium leaves us disappointed. However we do not give up hope and believe -- as yesterday's declaration also says -- that common sense will triumph in the end. And this is why we have prolonged our moratorium. We proceed here on the basis of support of the world public. [end recording]

Arbatov Analyzes U.S. Stance

PM191530 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by Academician G. Arbatov: "An Act of Great Political Boldness"]

[Text] We have been talking a great deal recently about new thinking -- the thinking that has become absolutely essential in the nuclear age for mankind's survival and progress. M.S. Gorbachev's statement on Soviet television is a graphic example of such thinking.

Primarily because this speech again spelled out in precise terms the fundamental principles of the new approach to international affairs that determine the Soviet

foreign policy course -- understanding of the total unacceptability of war as a means to achieve a political objective and also of the fact that the only security that can be achieved is mutual security in keeping with both sides' needs. This is a new view of our planet, of a world so complex and full of acute contradictions and at the same time integral in terms of its interdependence.

The main issue is the very decision substantiated and spelled out in the speech -- the decision to again, once more, extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. This is a vivid example not only of the new political thinking but of the new thinking translated into action, into political practice and political action.

Here I would like to talk about the two immutable components of the new thinking and new policy: political realism on one hand and boldness on the other. Realism, indeed, permeates M.S. Gorbachev's entire important statement, whether it is talking about the present situation in the world and the policy of the United States and its allies or about our own views of international problems, of our objectives, and equally of our force and potential. This is realism built on scrupulous analysis both of what we like and what repels us and on an in-depth assessment of the consequences of the decision being taken, the degree of risk linked with it, its pluses and minuses.

As for boldness, in politics, paradoxical as it may seem, it is much more necessary for a shift toward peace than for a further drift toward military confrontation. In our time political moderation and restraint, not to mention a readiness for compromise, in general require much more political courage, self-confidence, and resoluteness than saber rattling, clamorous implacability, and "muscle-flexing." This may be particularly obvious to those who attentively follow the development of the political situation in the United States, where Rambo shooting in all directions has become a heroic symbol and where incessant bragging, vanity, and bellicose nationalism have come back into political fashion. And where the greatest fear is not even of dangerous mistakes in policy but of accusations of "softness" toward communists and the Russians and a readiness to compromise, which is called "appeasement."

Fear of being reasonable, fear of being restrained and patient, no matter for what reason, is becoming a great danger in the nuclear age. The Soviet Union does not allow itself to become infected with such fear. Today real political boldness is the sister of wisdom and circumspection. I believe that the world public will conclude that the Soviet Union has again demonstrated all these important qualities and again displayed great circumspection, wisdom, and political maturity.

It has thereby also given the U.S. Administration yet another good chance to display these important qualities.

All these ideas permeated the statement itself. This morning, laying aside my pen, I switched on the radio and heard the first reactions to M.S. Gorbachev's statement, including, from the United States, official reactions emanating both from the State Department and also from White House spokesmen. They indicate that the chance offered by the Soviet Union will again be passed up, or rather rejected, by Washington on the pretext that it is allegedly a question of "Soviet propaganda" again. The American and world public has already heard this rubbish umpteen times before. And the question that undoubtedly arises with increasing frequency is: If ending nuclear explosions as a prelude to reducing and then completely eliminating nuclear weapons is propaganda, how is that bad? And why should the United States not respond with the same kind of "propaganda" and take a real and weighty step in limiting and reducing arms? Why should the two powers not develop rivalry in this sphere -- the sphere of actions, not just words -- instead of continuing to compete in the development and stockpiling of

lethal weapons? Both Americans and Russians, and the entire world too, would heave an enormous sigh of relief if this happened.

But Washington continues to be against it. In saying "no," one official spokesman attempted to hide behind the French -- they allegedly also consider it necessary to continue tests. Another again grunted something about the problem of verification [kontrol] -- but very inarticulately, because you cannot think up articulate arguments on this score now, when American seismographs have been set up in the immediate vicinity of Soviet tests sites. Yet another said that the United States must "catch up" with the Russians since they only stopped testing after securing superiority for themselves. Oh, those Russians: In general they have carried out one-third fewer nuclear explosions than the Americans and in the last year have not carried out any (in response to the Americans' 18) and have pledged to observe the moratorium for another half-year, and still there is no way to catch up with them!

Incidentally, it is hardly worth looking for logic in these evasions or in the American position itself. In the face of the Soviet proposals and initiatives they are losing their last fig leaves, exposing the unseemly reality -- an obsession with arms and the arms race. But I do not want to stop here. It is not a question of propaganda, not a question of winning another point the polemic in progress. A very great deal is at stake -- ultimately the fate and very future of mankind. And this is a question to which "no" cannot be accepted as an answer, no matter how many times this "no" is stubbornly repeated.

No Change in U.S. Position

LD191607 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 19 Aug 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast];

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] A White House spokesman declined to give an appraisal of the decision of the Soviet Union, and stated that at the White House the text of the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev had not yet been seen.

At the same time he said that the U.S. position on joining the moratorium on nuclear tests had not changed since a moratorium on nuclear tests was allegedly not in the security interests of the United States, its friends or its allies, and nuclear tests were needed by the United States to ensure the effectiveness of its nuclear deterrent forces. [passage omitted]

Speakes' Comments Criticized

LD200136 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Excerpts] The response of officials in the United States to the Soviet initiative is distinctly negative. Here is what our observer Vladyslav Kozyakov writes:

Upon receiving the report from Moscow, members of the U.S. Administration declared their opposition to a joint halt to nuclear tests. White House secretary Larry Speakes with the President in Santa Barbara, California, said on Monday that although the administration had not yet seen the full text of the Soviet statement, opposition of the United States to the Soviet moratorium had not changed.

Judging by what he said the arguments the administration is using to explain this stand have not changed either. The arguments are in favor of an arms build-up. According to

Larry Speakes, America needs nuclear tests for a nuclear deterrent, for its own security and for the security of its allies. As this statement makes clear, the American leaders intend to abide by the balance of fear philosophy. Meanwhile the great danger of such an approach becomes more and more obvious. Balance of fear is a poor adviser. It ceases to be a factor of deterrent. Fear tends to whip up the arms race and to increase mistrust and suspicion. It forms a vicious circle of a build-up of tensions, which certainly fails to meet the interests of anyone's security.

Incidentally, when they speak of a nuclear deterrent. America's leaders mean not merely maintaining the existing nuclear arsenals, but increasing them further through the development of new types of weapons on earth and in space. [passage omitted] The above facts show that when it speaks of a nuclear deterrent, Washington means attaining military superiority, and this is what the tests in Nevada are needed for. And yet this policy does not promote security. On the contrary, it undermines security.

In his Monday statement, Larry Speakes again claimed there were some unresolved matters in verifying a test ban. This sounds strange to say the least, especially in the light of the fact that near the Soviet proving ground in the region of Semipalatinsk, American experts have registered nuclear explosions carried out in Nevada. Verification has nothing to do with all this. What is important is that Washington refuses to take the road of honest, constructive talks on halting the arms race. [passage omitted]

But there is no time to be lost. The security of both the United States and the Soviet Union and also of all other countries calls for urgent measures to curb the arms race. And a nuclear test ban could become one such measure. [passage citing]

Solton Commentary

LD192323 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Excerpts] The Soviet Union has extended its unilateral nuclear test moratorium until the end of the year. Mikhail Gorbachev announced this in his television address to the nation on Monday. Here is what our commentator Yuriy Solton writes on the new Soviet political initiative.

The Soviet Union has made no nuclear tests over the past 12 months and it will not make any till 1 January next year. The Soviet Union has extended its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests for the fourth time and this was no easy decision to make. The international situation gives no reason for relaxing, however slightly, over national security issues. The Soviet Union cannot afford to ignore the behavior of the United States, which has bluntly called this country America's main potential adversary. What was Washington's response to the Soviet nuclear moratorium? What was its attitude to the Soviet proposal that nuclear weapons be abolished by the end of the century and armed forces and conventional weapons reduced considerably. Over the past year, while the Soviet moratorium has been in force, the United States has made 18 nuclear tests. In the past 40 years Washington has been the leader in the number of nuclear tests it has made. Of the 18 nuclear tests that went ahead since the Soviet moratorium was introduced, 3 were not announced. The U.S. tests were not merely aimed at testing the viability of operational nuclear weapons. They were also aimed at developing third generation nuclear weapons to be used, for instance, in a space-based nuclear energized laser. U.S. nuclear assembly lines, meanwhile, continue to churn out more and more nuclear weapons. A few days ago the command of the U.S. Air Force announced that the 131st B-52 bomber had been modernized to carry cruise missiles.

This indicates that the United States is about to go beyond the limitations of the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty. As Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out, the Soviet Union has every ground to resume nuclear testing. Members of the Soviet public have asked in their letters whether it made any sense for the Soviet Union to continue with its nuclear moratorium on its own while the United States behaves so provocatively. But, nevertheless, having carefully weighed the pros and cons, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet Government decided to extend the nuclear test moratorium to 1 January 1987. They took into consideration appeals coming in from all parts of the world to give those bent on continued nuclear testing another chance to sober up. [passage omitted] The first response to the Soviet move indicates that the Soviet leadership's decision has met with understanding and approval. It is seen as an important action, proving that the Soviet Union is serious about its program for nuclear disarmament rather than a mere proposal. The initial response of the U.S. Administration is in stark contrast with this. Having barely read the statement of the Soviet leader, administration officials tried to play down its importance, having dismissed it as propaganda. One cannot help wondering what prevents the United States from engaging in that kind of propaganda.

There can be no doubt at all that if the United States halted its nuclear tests the move would be approved by the world community. An official spokesman for the White House declared that in the foreseeable future the United States will need nuclear tests and this shows clearly how far the militarization of political thinking has gone in Washington. The U.S. Administration cannot bring itself to accept honest agreements to improve the international climate but there is no getting away from the realities of this day and age.

Zholkver Reports Responses

LD192056 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver report]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted on positive world reaction to moratorium] So far the White House representative has avoided giving an assessment of the USSR's decision, saying that President Reagan, who is now on holiday, has still not seen the text of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement.

At the same time, the representative pointed out the fact that the U.S. stance on joining the nuclear test moratorium has not changed, since these tests, as he stressed, are vital for the United States to ensure the effectiveness of its nuclear deterrent forces. And so we have evidence of the same old political way of thinking, in categories of the politics of force and the balance of terror. However, an increasing number of eminent political and state figures in the West are pointing out the inertia and danger of this thinking. Owen, the leader of the British Social Democratic Party, has called upon the British Government to show the whole world that it does not intend to support the United States in conducting more nuclear tests aimed at transferring nuclear explosions into space. Even a government spokesman for the FRG that first pupil in the Atlantic class, has announced their intention of encouraging the United States to conclude an agreement on the cessation of nuclear tests.

And in the United States itself, five eminent politicians, including three former defense secretaries, have just unambiguously condemned the policy of the arms race. The widespread and positive reaction to Comrade Gorbachev's statement is graphic evidence of a strengthening of the position of the forces advocating realism in politics and the cessation of the senseless arms race.

U.S. 'Defensive Position' Noted

LD191851 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 19 Aug 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Dmitriy Biryukov]

[Excerpts] If one were to try to summarize the content of the responses, which have come in today from the foreign press, to the statement made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on Soviet television on 18 August, then one could say the following: First, the international public highly commends the new peace initiative of the USSR; secondly, it is noted that the Soviet Union is doing everything in its power to secure a peaceful future for the planet and radically improve the situation in the world. [passage omitted]

But a representative of the White House has again evaded giving an evaluation of the Soviet Union's decision, stating that in the White House they have still not seen the text of the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Taking advantage of the opportunity, this representative said that the U.S. position regarding joining the moratorium on nuclear tests has not changed, because such a moratorium, supposedly, does not meet the security interests of the United States, its friends and allies, and nuclear tests are essential to the United States for guaranteeing the effectiveness of the nuclear deterrent forces. This statement clearly bears traces of rashness. It is also strange that in the White House they have not seen the speech by the Soviet leader. The point is that the CNN television company broadcast Comrade Gorbachev's speech, and many specialists on Soviet-U.S. relations immediately commented on it, noting that his is an impressive policy move that is forcing the United States to assume a defensive position. [passage omitted]

CNN Comments Reported

PM191455 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 20 Aug 86 p 1

[TASS report: "Former Positions"]

[Text] Washington, 19 Aug -- A White House spokesman declined to assess the Soviet Union's decision, stating that the White House had "not yet seen" the text of M.S. Gorbachev's statement. [paragraph continues]

At the same time he said that the U.S. position regarding joining a moratorium on nuclear tests had not changed because a moratorium on nuclear tests allegedly "does not accord with the security interests of the United States and its friends and allies" and "the United States needs nuclear tests to ensure the effectiveness of its nuclear deterrence forces."

At the same time the CNN TV, relaying the Soviet leader's speech, called it "one of the most important foreign policy statements by the USSR in recent times." The fact that M.S. Gorbachev referred to the possible signing at a summit of an agreement on nuclear explosions proves that he wants to reach an arms control agreement at that summit, the TV company pointed out. However, to all appearances, the Reagan administration has no such desire.

Report From Washington

LD192042 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Vladimir Dunayev report from Washington; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The U.S. President is now in California resting in his ranch. The White House spokesman said immediately after the statement by Comrade Gorbachev had become known, that halting nuclear tests was not acceptable to the United States. A State Department spokesman in Washington said the same thing. So there is nothing new -- an instantaneous, negative reaction. Well, there are practically no arguments.

But can one say that the appeal to the United States, the appeal on behalf of the Soviet people, of Comrade Gorbachev, to the reason, to the dignity of the Americans has gone unheard? I would not say that. The first reaction in the papers and on television -- and it was reported, not in great detail but the essence of the statement and initiatives contained in Comrade Gorbachev's statement was reported -- there was also reaction from Congress. Congress is also on vacation now, congressmen and senators have left Washington, but in those circles their initial reaction was very optimistic.

As you know, the House of Representatives the other day adopted a decision not to finance further U.S. nuclear weapons tests for a year after 1 January 1987. This decision still has to be agreed by the Senate, but nevertheless it is very indicative.

As far as the American man in the street is concerned, today I phoned several families who last August sent letters to Comrade Gorbachev when the unilateral Soviet moratorium was announced. Today these people told me of the feelings they experienced, of how grateful they were to our country for the moratorium, for its extension, for the fact that for a year now there has been quiet on the Soviet nuclear test grounds, for the fact that we again extended it until 1 January.

One of them, Lauren Ross told me: You had every right to resume tests. No one could have blamed you. You waited too long for a reply from the United States, but you were quite right to decide to go on waiting because we are not sitting doing nothing now. We are ordinary Americans.

We are challenging our congressmen -- remember the decision they made? We are not appealing to the President. The latest polls show that most Americans are in favor of halting nuclear tests. Yes, it is a burden to bear. The burden will not be wasted. We will try to prove we're more stubborn than anyone from the Pentagon. [passage omitted]

UK Reaction Termed 'Strange'

LD191557 Moscow TASS in English 1529 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 19 TASS -- Follows commentary by TASS writer Vladimir Malyshev:

One cannot help describing as very strange the British Government's reaction to the Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts till January 1, 1987. As follows from a REUTER agency report, the British Foreign Office has found nothing better than express over that ... "regret." "We regret," the statement said, "the Soviet Union has concentrated its efforts on such unilateral approaches and would much prefer it if these efforts had been concentrated on the

various Western initiatives at the Geneva Disarmament Conference." In the opinion of the British Foreign Office, unilateral moratorium is not the best way of reaching agreements on arms control.

The amazing thing here is not so much the attempt at rejecting outright the USSR's new peaceable initiative, such a rejection is an infrequent method of the Western powers, as the wish to picture the unilateral moratorium as something strange and suspicious. But if someone commits itself to stop exploding nuclear devices, how can one "regret" that? Or, from London's viewpoint there is nothing better than explode and explode nuclear bombs? Or the matter is that such a commitment has again been made by the Soviet Union?

Yet Whitehall is known to react quite differently -- nodding approvingly and saying yes -- when the USA and the other NATO countries, including Britain itself, declare a build-up of the arms race, start of preparations for the "star wars" and development of ever new types of mass destruction weapons. Don't these steps, which bring mankind to the verge of a nuclear catastrophe, deserve every condemnation and regret?

Certainly, a unilateral moratorium is not enough to ensure arms control. It would be much better, had all the other nuclear powers given up all nuclear weapons testing. But, apparantly, neither the USA nor its NATO allies are in a hurry to follow the USSR's noble example. Here is what should be regretted most profoundly...

FRG's Genscher Praises Address

LD191428 Moscow TASS in English 1404 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Bonn August 19 TASS -- The speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central committee, over the Soviet TV network has shown again the Soviet interest in disarmament negotiations, said here today Hans-Dietrich Genscher, foreign minister of the FRG.

The decision announced by Mikhail Gorbachev to extend the Soviet nuclear tests moratorium to January 1, 1987, he stressed, is of great importance for reaching all-embracing prohibition of nuclear tests.

Touching on the question of a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the federal minister voiced support for reaching understanding at it on complete prohibition of nuclear arms tests. The West German Government acclaims the fact that Mikhail Gorbachev attaches great importance to cooperation in all spheres which are important for mankind's future, said Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

Bundestag Official on Extension

LD191728 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Bonn August 19 TASS -- Deputy chairman of the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Socialist Union] faction in the Bundestag Volker Ruehe has welcomed the Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions up to January 1, next year. In an official statement today he called upon the Western powers to give a constructive reply to the new Soviet initiative.

Mies Welcomes Announcement

LD192044 Moscow TASS in English 1424 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Bonn August 19 TASS -- The Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions till January 1, 1987, announced by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, was welcomed by Chairman of the German Communist Party Herbert Mies. In a statement published here today he highly assessed the Soviet Union's constructive step which attests to lofty responsibility of the Soviet Union's party and state leadership for the destinies of the world. The USSR uses every opportunity to break the vicious circle of the disastrous arms race and to open the road to fruitful and constructive talks with the United States on the entire complex of the problems of nuclear disarmament, the statement says. No positive reaction to the Soviet Union's gesture of goodwill has yet come from the U.S. side, the state says. Herbert Mies urged the FRG Government to influence United States so that it alter its position.

Sweden's Carlsson Statement Noted

LD192104 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Stockholm August 19 TASS -- The Swedish Government received with satisfaction the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, says a statement of Sweden's Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson, circulated here today. The prime minister assessed positively the Soviet Union's new important initiative aimed at curbing the nuclear arms race which General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev announced in a statement on the Soviet television.

In the United Nations and at other forums, Sweden supported the calls addressed above all to the USSR and the USA to adopt unilaterally or jointly a moratorium on nuclear explosions as a temporary measure till a multilateral treaty on banning nuclear testing is concluded. The "Mexican Declaration" is the latest example of this, the statement says. The Swedish Government hopes that further contacts between the USSR and the USA in the sphere of disarmament might lead, specifically, to the conclusion of a multilateral treaty on a complete ban on nuclear testing, Ingvar Carlsson noted.

PRC Notes Speech

LD191719 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] XINHUA reports: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said the Soviet Union was sure that an agreement on halting nuclear tests could be reached quickly and signed already this year at the Soviet-U.S. summit. Such an agreement, he noted, would be the main real outcome of the meeting and a significant step on the road to halting the arms race.

DPRK Foreign Ministry Hails Offer

LD201025 Moscow TASS in English 0948 GMT 20 Aug 86

[Text] Pyongyang August 20 TASS -- The Foreign Ministry of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has hailed the Soviet Union's decision to extend a unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts as a constructive and positive step towards removing the risk of outbreak of a world nuclear war and as striking evidence of the USSR's unwavering desire for world peace.

It said the Soviet proposals for ensuring peace in Europe and Asia and scrapping all nuclear weapons on earth and the decisions to announce and extend the moratorium have won the support of the people of socialist countries and all peace forces. But the United States, ignoring the opinion of the people of goodwill, continues testing nuclear weapons and making dangerous "star wars" plans.

If the moratorium assumes a global nature and nuclear testing is banned everywhere on earth, mankind will be saved from a nuclear catastrophe and further prerequisites will be created for stronger peace and security throughout the world, the statement said.

The Soviet Union's latest peace step, the DPRK Foreign Ministry said, meets the interests of also the Korean people keen to reduce tension in the Korean peninsula and establish a nuclear-free zone of peace there. The United States should positively respond to a proposal by the DPRK, renounce its positions-of-strength policy, end the arms race and stop all nuclear testing.

PRK's Sim on 'Important Step'

LD191707 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 19 TASS -- Another important step on the road to peace and detente, this is how the Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions was summed up by member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea, chairman of Kampuchea's National Assembly Chea Sim. He heads a delegation of Kampuchean parliamentarians which arrived today in Moscow for an official friendly visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Kampuchean people fully supports the foreign policy course of the Soviet state, its new scopeful initiatives aimed at the creation of an all-embracing system of international security, at the development of equal cooperation of all peoples of the Asian-Pacific region, Chea Sim said.

Honecker Highlights Decision

LD192023 Moscow TASS in English 1934 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Berlin August 19 TASS -- The German Democratic Republic welcomes the decision of the Soviet Union to prolong its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until January 1, 1987, declared on Soviet TV by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

This is a significant step in the interests of peace, said today Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and chairman of the GDR's Council of State.

The GDR regards the task of strengthening peace as important, he continued. Today when mankind faces the threat of nuclear annihilation, the German state is seeking ways of preserving peace and improving the international climate.

Polish Government Lauds Plan

LD192011 Moscow TASS in English 1602 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Warsaw August 19 TASS -- The Government of the Polish People's Republic fully supports the Soviet peace proposals which were made by General Secretary of the CPSU

Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in his Soviet television statement. They express the common peace strategy of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and are aimed at restraining the arms race and removing the threat of a nuclear war, said the Polish Government's spokesman at a press conference which was held here today.

Poland is and will be a constructive partner of the Soviet Union, and also all progressive forces which are working to prevent a nuclear catastrophe, he said. The safety of the world calls for unity of the peace efforts of all nations. Poland is a country which sustained heavy losses in the Second World War. The Poles therefore keenly realize the danger which comes from the U.S. militaristic course. The Government of the Polish People's Republic stresses that the Soviet Union's new initiative -- its decision to prolong the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions up to January 1, 1987, is a measure aimed at preventing the threat of war, an act of goodwill meeting the interests of all nations.

IZVESTIYA Commentator Cited

LD192124 Prague Television Service in Czech 1730 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] A number of questions emerged in connection with yesterday's address to Comrade Gorbachev both at home and abroad. How will it influence Soviet-U.S. relations? How will it influence the security of the USSR? Our Moscow correspondent asked these questions to IZVESTIYA commentator Melor Sturua.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] How do you assess yesterday's statement of Mikhail Gorbachev in the context of Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Sturua in Russian with superimposed translation] The decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests 1 January 1987 has far-reaching significance for the development of USSR-U.S. relations from the viewpoint of strengthening peace and international security. Comrade Gorbachev stressed in particular in his television address that this would be the most important result of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, that it would mean an impulse for further development of talks in the direction of creating control over the arms race in favor of disarmament. Thus, our initiative would represent an impulse for the further development of USSR-U.S. relations, both bilateral and those that concern the interests of all mankind, of course, only in the event that the U.S. side adopts a positive attitude toward our initiative.

Does time not work against the interest of the USSR's security during the time of the moratorium's validity? Yes, the question of our own security undoubtedly concerns us. However, after carefully considering all the pros and cons we have, after all decided to extend the moratorium. The point is not that we thus risk our security, but that we implement new thinking in international politics.

So we are thus giving the U.S. side yet another opportunity to follow our example so that the problem of disarmament may move away from the deadlock. At the same time, of course, we will not forget about our security and the security of our friends, neither will we allow this security to be threatened in any way by those reactionary forces that have longed so much for political and social revenge in these countries. [end recording]

Delegates View Issue

LD191827 Moscow TASS in English 1452 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Geneva August 19 TASS -- The attention of delegates to the Conference on Disarmament focused on the statement of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Mikhail Gorbachev on the Soviet television. The question of the complete ban on nuclear testing necessitates urgent and effective measures, head of the GDR delegation Harald Rose said at the plenary meeting. He said the decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions till January 1, 1987, is a new proof of the Soviet Union's resolve to do its utmost to put an end to the nuclear arms race. Harald Rose expressed deep regret over the United States negative reaction to the Soviet proposal. The arguments of the adversaries of such a ban ignore the interests of universal security, he said. He noted that termination of testing by the USSR and the USA would have a positive effect on the development of the international situation and would prompt other countries having nuclear weapons to follow their example.

Representative of the People's Republic of Bulgaria Borislav Konstantinov emphasized the extreme importance of the Soviet leader's statement. He described the extension of the unilateral moratorium as a new confirmation of the consistent course of the Soviet foreign policy at the consolidation of peace and international security. Noting that the Soviet Union had not been conducting any tests for over a year, the Bulgarian delegate said that it was not easy to extend the moratorium in conditions of the present tense situation. But the Soviet Union extended the moratorium which creates a favourable atmosphere for a complete ending of nuclear explosions and for nuclear disarmament, Borislav Konstantinov said. He expressed the confidence that the Soviet initiative will be approved and supported by the world public and the participants in the Conference on Disarmament.

UN Press Conference Held

LD191839 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] New York August 19 TASS -- The USSR permanent representation at the United Nations Organization held today a press conference at the United Nations headquarters in connection with the extension of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions announced by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. It was emphasized at the press conference that the Soviet moratorium prove the seriousness and sincerity of the Soviet programme of nuclear disarmament, is the call for conducting a new policy, the policy of realism, peace and cooperation.

Pasko Rounds Up Reaction

LD191840 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Excerpts] Comrade Gorbachev's statement on Soviet television, in which he announced the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions to 1 January, is the focus of world public attention.

Here is commentator Vladimir Pasko:

[Pasko] I want to acquaint you, comrades, with reports we have received from our correspondents during the last few hours. Over to Vasiliy Lesovik in Warsaw:

[Lesovik] The statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee has met with a wide response in Poland. The full text of the statement was published by the central press today. It was accompanied by extensive commentaries. The newspaper RZECZPOSPOLITA, for example, described the Soviet Government's decision to extend the moratorium on all nuclear explosions as a historic chance for mankind. TRYBUNA LUDU writes that the importance of the decision lies also in the fact that the USSR has proposed that an agreement on the cessation of nuclear tests should be concluded this year, during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. The world is waiting for a constructive answer from Washington, TRYBUNA LUDU stressed.

[Pasko] Our correspondents in Budapest and Prague, Vladimir Stefanov and Aleksandr Kuzin, speak of a similar reaction. Over to Budapest.

[Stefanov] This morning I had a talk with Gabor Borbely, editor in chief of the newspaper NEPSZABADSAG. He said that the Soviet Government's decision was yet another real chance to stop before it is too late. We all hope that this chance will not be rejected by the U.S. side. [passage omitted]

[Pasko] Boris Kalyagin reports from London on the reaction of the British public opinion.

[Kalyagin] On their front pages the main British newspapers publish detailed reports on Comrade Gorbachev's speech. In a heading to its lead article, the London GUARDIAN declares that it is time to respond to Gorbachev. The paper calls on the United States and Great Britain to follow the Soviet example. George Robertson, a foreign affairs spokesman for the Labor Party, said that Soviet initiative had opened up greater opportunities for trying to halt a further escalation of the arms race. At the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament headquarters I was told that the constructive new step by the Soviet Union inspires British peace supporters. They will step up the pressure on their government, demanding that Britain stop nuclear tests itself and influence the U.S. Administration in the same direction.

I think the only cool response to Comrade Gorbachev's statement came today from a spokesman for the British Foreign Office. He expressed regret that the Soviet Union was concentrating its endeavors on unilateral measures instead of Western initiatives which, he said, would make it easier to achieve a ban on tests. But we have not heard of any such initiatives.

[Pasko] A TASS correspondent reports from Washington that a White House representative has refused to comment on the Soviet Union's decision, saying that the White House has not yet seen the text of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement. At the same time he said that the U.S. position on joining in the moratorium on nuclear tests has not changed, because the moratorium on nuclear tests allegedly does not meet the security interests of the United States and its friends and allies and because the United States needs nuclear tests in order to ensure the effectiveness of its nuclear deterrent.

Such, comrades, are the first reactions in the world to the Soviet Union's important new initiative.

Washington Press Conference Held

LD201912 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT 20 Aug 86

[Text] Washington August 20 TASS -- A press conference devoted to the statement of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev on Soviet television was held at the USSR Embassy in Washington today. The importance of the Soviet Union's decision on the extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions for the improvement of the international situation and ending of the arms race was emphasized particularly at the press conference. The attention of the journalists present at the press conference was also drawn to the entire complex of the Soviet Union's peace initiatives.

U.S. 'Softened' Position Noted

LD201434 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 20 Aug 86

[Viktor Glazunov commentary]

[Text] As always, Washington's first reaction to the extension of the Soviet moratorium was a no. But then the United States sort of softened its position: The White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan said the United States isn't actually against banning nuclear tests in principle, but it is against a ban without appropriate control.

And so again the problem of control has been brought up. It has been a stumbling block for decades. The fact is, however, that this has been an artificially created problem from the very start. It was back in the late fifties that experts arrived at the conclusion that it is impossible to conceal nuclear tests.

For more than a year now the Soviet unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions has been in effect, and the silence at the Soviet nuclear testing grounds is, so to say, registered everywhere, just like nuclear blasts set off by the United States are registered. And though officially the Americans announced that they've conducted 15 nuclear tests in the period the Soviet moratorium has been in effect the world knows that there were 18 of them.

You cannot conceal anything here. But since the United States kept insisting that national monitoring is not enough and that it should be supplemented by international on-site inspections, the Soviet Union agreed to that. American monitoring equipment has already been installed in the area of the Soviet nuclear testing site near Semipalatinsk. True, all it registers now are nuclear explosions in Nevada. It would seem that after American's demand on international inspections was satisfied, the stumbling block would be removed on the road to concluding an agreement on banning all nuclear explosions. However, Washington continues to exploit the problem, and all because in reality it does not want to end nuclear tests. Washington said that a certain amount of them is necessary and so proposes monitoring those allegedly necessary explosions.

So instead of monitoring a nuclear test halt there's to be control over carrying out the explosions. And that of course is not serious. The only thing that control over nuclear explosions can do is whip up competition in conducting them and thus whip up the arms race. And that seems to be the purpose of Washington, which seeks by all means to implement its star wars program.

White House View Assailed

OW210855 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1015 GMT 20 Aug 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] President Reagan is presently having a holiday on his ranch in California and his press secretary, Larry Speakes, as you see, is also dressed as if he was on leave. [video shows Larry Speakes, dressed in casual clothes, attending press conference] Thus dressed, he informed journalists that his chief has not evaluated the USSR decision since supposedly he has not seen the text of General Secretary Gorbachev's statement.

It should be noted that, given the desire, it would have been possible to acquaint oneself with the statement even if only through U.S. television, which this time, contrary to usual practice, carried the speech of the Soviet leader live, with accompanied English translation.

No, the matter here is clearly not that of a lack of knowledge of the Soviet initiative, but rather of not wishing to support it. The same Speakes, you see directly stated that the U.S. position regarding joining the moratorium on nuclear testing has not changed since these tests are necessary to the United States to ensure the effectiveness of nuclear deterrent forces.

And so, once again, we are faced with the same old political thinking categorized by politics of force and balance of fears.

Regan's Comments Outlined

LD202237 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Aug 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The ABC television company reports on a press conference that was given in Washington by Regan, head of the White House staff. Responding to a question by journalists about Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's proposal to sign at a summit meeting an agreement on an end to nuclear tests, he claimed the United States has no objection to such a treaty but is against including an inappropriate monitoring system. It is well-known by the way, that the Soviet Union is in favor of monitoring, and that Washington is continuing to exploit this problem trying to conceal its reluctance to disarm.

Bovin Commentary

LD202013 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Aug 86

[Commentary by Aleksandr Bovin, political observer of IZVESTIYA; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Good day, comrades. As a rule, important political decisions are not easy ones. This fully applies to the decision of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the Soviet Government to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev described this move as a hard and difficult one. Indeed, here we have to weigh and compare both political and military-technical considerations.

For more than a year we have stopped carrying out tests. Habitual logic prompts the following set of thoughts. If we need tests to strengthen our security, a unilateral cessation of them clearly weakens security and could give some advantages to the Americans. Many of us are alarmed, worried about this. Is not the risk here too great? Is time working against us? Are we giving away too much? Comrade Gorbachev's statement in fact contains a detailed answer to all the questions worrying us.

Let us consider the questions together. In the nuclear age, security based on a build-up of armaments is becoming more and more dangerous. After all, the more arms there are, the less trust there is. The less trust there is, the more likelihood there is that these weapons will be used. Therefore, in our day true security can only be provided by political accords, by an agreement on reductions on both sides and, subsequently, the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Our position on nuclear tests is aimed at solving this principal task.

Of course, we all realize that there is a time limit to unilateral measures. If the Americans repeat their monotonous "no" over and over again, testing will have to be resumed. But for the time being the political "pros" clearly still outweigh the possible military-technical "cons". Any analogy is relative, but take chess. You can sacrifice quantity for quality. It's just the same here. By extending the moratorium we are obtaining -- we are strengthening our political positions. We are increasing the pressure on the Americans. We are giving additional stimulus to the anti-war, anti-nuclear movement. We say again and yet again the everybody: Let us put the entire problem of security onto a different plane. Let us abandon a balance of terror in favor of a balance of trust and interests. This approach alone is in keeping with the realities of the nuclear age.

Washington's first official reaction is disappointing. Reagan has again said "no". Against the background of this "no", the optimistic remarks about a summit meeting that can be heard in the United States at the moment sound very strange. The meaning of Moscow's message is clear: We are resuming tests. We invite the Americans to sit down at the negotiating table and reach agreement on a mutual test ban. Furthermore, we are prepared -- during talks, of course -- to most carefully discuss and resolve the problem of verification, just as we are prepared to discuss any other questions of interest to the sides. This is the basis, if you like to put it that way, for real optimism.

But, unfortunately, Washington is unwilling to comprehend this -- for the time being, I add in hope.

Round Table Examines Issue

LD202306 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 20 Aug 86

["Ending Nuclear Tests Is the Command of the Times" program with Political Observer Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, Political Observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin and Commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

[Text] [Levin] Greetings, esteemed comrades. The very title of our broadcast, "Ending Nuclear Tests Is the Command of the Times," clearly indicates that today we are to talk about the statement made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, about the decision made by the USSR on its further continuation, now its fourth, of the moratorium on carrying out nuclear explosions. This time USSR decided to prolong the moratorium until 1 January 1987.

At the same time Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev expressed the hope that success would be achieved at the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit in signing an agreement on the total ending of nuclear tests -- an agreement with the United States -- and thus to considerably advance the cause of disarmament.

But the statement, of course, is not limited to just this matter, for it gives a very profound analysis of the contemporary international situation and explains in great detail and in very specific terms the need for new thinking in the nuclear age.

[Shishlin] Yes, indeed. The USSR considers that a decision not only by the USSR but also by the United States in favor of a moratorium on nuclear tests could be the fundamental outcome of the possible Soviet-U.S. summit. But let us be frank. Whereas the USSR is going its part of the way confidently and without interruptions, we cannot yet say this about the United States, just as we cannot say that, in itself, the question of a Soviet-U.S. meeting has already been predetermined, or that the green light has been given for the leaders of two of the world's major states to sit down at the negotiating table.

And as far as the reaction to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement is concerned, as far as those ideas are concerned, they have indeed met with a very broad response in the world. They are being given very energetic, specific and active support by our socialist friends and allies. It seems that they are arousing interest not only in the socialist countries that are members of the Warsaw Pact organization. You know, and I imagine that our listeners already know from the initial responses, that on the whole this statement, if I may use a more powerful expression, has aroused a tidal wave of response literally in all corners of the globe.

I do not want to oversimplify the reaction this statement aroused throughout the world. There are political circles and public forces of reactionary temperament that react in a very restrained manner to every Soviet initiative. Unfortunately, we have to take account of such ways of acting and with such reactions. It must be seen that currently a very complicated and responsible struggle is under way. This is indeed a historic chance.

[Zorin] In connection with this I would like to call the attention of our listeners to the reaction in the United States. It has not been unanimous. On one hand, the responses we have on hand at the moment indicate that quite broad circles of the U.S. public have received the moratorium with approval and support, and these are not just those public circles that usually advocate disarmament and freezing nuclear weapons. They also include influential circles in the U.S. capital. At this instant the election campaign is in full swing and many congressmen are to face their voters at the beginning of November. At such a time U.S. congressmen pay considerably more attention to the moods of the voters than at other times. In the first days and the first hours after the Soviet proposals as set out by Mikhail Sergeyevich became known, it turns out that influential Washington figures have come out quite definitely and positively in connection with the Soviet proposals.

However, we cannot pass over what I would call the unseemly haste, which is inappropriate to the problem, with which official circles and in particular people from President Reagan's close entourage reacted. They stated that the idea of a moratorium, the idea of ending nuclear tests, was unacceptable for them.

Here I would like to return somewhat to the history of the matter. From the very moment that the USSR first announced its moratorium influential Washington circles displayed a negative reaction. Various versions of justification for such a negative reaction have followed one after the other.

The first version stated that the moratorium was a specific, partial, individual step that did not solve the great problem of ending the nuclear arms race. It must be said that this version did not last long because every sensible person very soon realized -- and major authorities spoke on this theme -- that such a simple-looking step as ending tests, a step that does not require lengthy talks or major financial outlays, or a long time, a simple step in the form of ending tests is really most effective in ending the escalation of nuclear armaments. This is because without tests it is not possible to create [sozdat] new types of nuclear weapons, it is not possible to create [sozdat] various systems that combine with existing ones. Thus such a simple measure as ending tests is a real step for solving tasks of really world historic importance. This became so obvious that arguments on this theme simply dried up and disappeared from the pages of the U.S. press.

Then a second version was put forward that carried on for a long time and is, perhaps, still carrying on now. This is the version about verification. Our listeners know the essence of the matter. They said that the USSR was not to be trusted; that we [the

United States] would cease testing but the USSR would secretly carry out tests, and so on and so forth. But the supports for this version were very soon undermined when the USSR stated that it was prepared for the most serious and comprehensive forms of verification including on-the-spot verification. This has been stated several times by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

Then the USSR moved on from statements and words to deeds. On the basis of an understanding between Soviet and U.S. scientists, and understanding was reached that a group of U.S. scientists should come to the USSR with their equipment. This equipment was set up in the region of Semipalatinsk in direct proximity of the testing area. This equipment was set up and is still there today....

[Levin, interrupting] Valentin Sergeyevich, it is interesting that this U.S. equipment did register nuclear explosions....

[Zorin, interrupting] Only in Nevada and not in the USSR. So, the equipment is effective. The equipment is not bad. But it became clear that the USSR not only says that it is prepared for verification but that it has already gone in for verification before an interstate agreement has been achieved.

[Shishlin] I, too, would like to come in with a riposte. According to the official, public, U.S. account during the period of the Soviet moratorium the United States has carried out 15 tests of nuclear weapons whereas in fact 18 tests have been carried out. We have yet again proved to the United States that we can count with the aid of our modern equipment. The United States has similar equipment.

[Zorin] That is, we registered the three unannounced underground explosions. Their location and their strength were registered. This was announced. Thus virtually the whole foundation of the argument about verification was shattered. This makes the fact that even now within the past 2 days some people in Washington are muttering about verification look even less serious. This is, of course, due to forces of circumstances.

And, finally, the third argument that was put forward right from the start and that is being put forward now simply because they cannot think up anything else -- the argument that this is simply propaganda. Well, in the first place one could say that this is good propaganda, and who is stopping the Americans from engaging in such propaganda? Let them score propaganda points in the same way and we will welcome it.

[Shishlin] Yes, not with words but with deeds.

[Zorin] Naturally. But, perhaps, this is not even the main point. Mikhail Sergeyevich said that it was not simple for us to make this decision, and I think that our listeners understand why it is not simple to make such a decision to stop tests especially in conditions when the other side is conducting them.

Let us ask the question: Is this not too high a price for propaganda if we are pursuing the aim simply of propaganda? Is it not too great a sacrifice in order to win propaganda points? It is perfectly obvious that the USSR is not taking these steps merely to win propaganda points. Prolonging the moratorium is not propaganda. Although it is propaganda as well, it is primarily policy, a bold and far-sighted policy by means of which the USSR is demonstrating to the whole world its goodwill, its sincere intentions, and its political resolve.

[Levin] This aspect, too, must be given the most serious attention. The USSR's decision to prolong the moratorium reflects in practice the new thinking, thinking dictated by the realities of the nuclear age. In his statement, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev listed three reasons why we adopted the decision to end nuclear tests. The first is that mankind is on the brink of sliding toward the nuclear abyss. It is essential to stop this process. The situation is becoming increasingly intolerable. The balance of terror is ceasing to be a restraining factor. From the arms race, from the logic of the arms race one must move over to the logic of solving the problems we encounter: limiting armaments, stopping the arms race and then starting on universal and total disarmament. We have precisely formulated our task: totally eliminate nuclear weapons by the year 2000. This is a specific example of the new thinking.

The second reason is that the moratorium decision is based on the adherence of socialism, as a social system, to the cause of peace, to a profound understanding of its responsibility for the fate of civilization. This decision is in accord with our philosophy and is in accord with our socialist morality.

Finally, the third reason. We have already touched upon it in general. It is an understanding of the deep changes in the world. The deep changes in the world on which our policy is constructed. The new thinking stems from the realities we encounter.

But what reply do we get for this? Speakes, the White House official press representative, at a briefing in Santa Barbara where President Reagan is now on vacation, stated in part that our position with regard to joining the moratorium on nuclear tests has not changed. A moratorium on nuclear tests, Speakes says, is not in the interests of the security of the United States, our friends and allies.

He went on to try and somehow justify this, saying: As we have noted previously, the USSR conducted a considerable modernization of its nuclear forces before it announced this moratorium; we have still not completed implementing the response to their modernization by the modernization of our forces. Well, let us, I think, turn to the figures. In the period since the USSR introduced its moratorium on 6 August 1985, as we have already mentioned, the Americans have carried out 18 nuclear explosions. All told, they had prior to 1 January 1986, that is this year, conducted 789 explosions plus just 8 that were officially announced [as heard], whereas the Soviet Union had conducted 565. It should be added that Britain conducted 38 explosions and France 135. If we take the percentage ratio, the share of the United States together with Britain and France accounts for 70 percent. What lagging behind is Speakes then talking about? After all the very logic of this assertion is based on the idea that we [the United States] are building up armaments and we will be building up armaments, because we consider this essential to ensure our security. But one cannot have security for one side to the detriment of the other side's security. This is also an element of the new political thinking -- an element from which there is no getting away.

[Shishlin] It seems to me there is a marked degree of confusion in the first reaction by official Washington to the bold Soviet decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. After all, what is said by Speakes, the White House spokesman, is not an argument. It is the absence of an argument. It seems that the United States was preparing for some other version of the political course of events. They were obviously rubbing their hands in advance and thinking of how they would applaud themselves, declaring: Just look; we have already said that the Soviet Union has simply introduced a moratorium for a certain period of time, since it has already held its tests.

You aptly recalled the number of nuclear tests on both sides. But once you have mentioned about how the number of nuclear tests looks from the viewpoint of their

quantity there is also indeed a political reckoning. This political reckoning, of course, lies in the fact that our silence and our long lull -- I have in mind the nuclear test-range, about which Mikhail Sergeyevich spoke in his statement -- has of course made itself heard. It has made itself heard. It has been appraised correctly. This is shown at the present time by the wave of support for the Soviet decision that we are seeing in all corners of the world, although on the other hand, of course, we do not oversimplify the fact that there are also forces that are still opposed to this decision. Nevertheless, one must say that one wants to hope that the United States has not said its final word on this matter.

[Zorin] I believe that the Washington administration is in a situation where there are grounds to consider that the final word has not been said. It finds itself facing a complicated political situation. This impetuous reaction reflects Washington's uncertainty and nervousness. This is the normal reaction. Just as when a frog's leg is touched with an electric current it immediately jerks, similarly Washington jerks its leg and instantly says no when there is such a proposal from Moscow, but after the initial reactions there will be reflections connected with the specific political situation. First, there is the problem of the allies. Nothing is simple for the United States regarding its allies, and the problem of the moratorium has now become one of the most acute issues in the Western alliance and NATO, issues that I would say divide Washington and the West European capitals. This is not because the people in the West European capitals take a much different view than Washington does, but because the people in the West European capitals are leaders who find themselves in a specific political situation in their own countries.

[Shishlin] Here is something that illustrates that point. As is well-known, there are approximately 5,000 nuclear warheads located at the present time in FRG territory. Well, the question is whether there has been an increase in the security of the FRG, which has been transformed into such an infernal weapons dump. Of course, there has been no increase. It seems to me that this is of concern not only to the Social Democrats, who have been speaking forthrightly about this, but also to the Free Democrats, to the Greens and also to the Christian Democrats in West Germany.

[Levin] In the final analysis, and this is a noteworthy fact, Chancellor Kohl sent a letter to the conference of the Delhi Six in the Mexican city of Ixtapa, which in general expressed agreement with their actions and demonstrated solidarity with a wide number of positions adopted by the Delhi Six. Yet this Delhi Six causes nothing but annoyance in official Washington.

[Zorin] There is a fairly complicated situation in Britain too, where the Thatcher government is rapidly losing its popularity. It is a situation that the Tory government is forced to take into account, and it is a situation that will be reflected in the relations on this issue between London and Washington in particular.

There are fairly complicated positions also in other major West European countries, and not only in the West European countries. Consequently, by reacting so hastily to the Soviet initiative, as Washington did, it has created for itself new difficult problems regarding its allies. That is one thing.

The second reality is the internal political situation in the United States. I have already mentioned the fact that features of the situation are unusual, since there will be elections at the beginning of November. Indeed, these elections are no cut-and-dried victory for the Republican Party, and public attitudes in the United States at present are such that the present administration's position toward the moratorium and towards the Soviet proposal could play a very serious and unfavorable

role for the Reagan administration in the outcome of the November elections. That is the second problem, into which the Reagan administration will run during the coming weeks and months, and which it will have to take into account.

[Shishlin] But of course we must take into consideration the fact that another socialist power, a nuclear power, the PRC has de facto not been conducting nuclear tests since 1980, and it has been displaying restraint in this respect, which is of course being given its due in Moscow.

[Levin] When Americans now reflect -- and they are indeed reflecting, as Valentin Sergeyevich said -- on their administration's position and on its arguments, they are more and more coming to the conclusion...[Levin changes thought] For example, the presenter of an NBC program said directly that the administration is refusing to acknowledge this, but the halting of nuclear explosions would obstruct the testing of the laser weapons that occupy a leading position in the star wars program. The United States asserts that a halting of tests cannot be verified without having verification posts on site, but critics point out that White House simply does not want to halt tests. One really has the impression that this notorious SDI is obscuring the U.S. administration's view of the real facts. There is the idea of creating this SDI. It is regarded as a decisive breakthrough in attaining military superiority over the Soviet Union and over the community of socialist states. Everything possible, and impossible, is being done for its sake. But, you see, life has repeatedly shown that the arms race cannot give the United States an advantage, just as it will not give an advantage to the Soviet Union. We understand this full well, but we do not set ourselves such a task. The statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev says directly that if they are calculating on intimidating us or on urging us into unnecessary expenditure by pushing through this SDI, nothing will come of it. If it is required, the Soviet leader said, we will find a response rapidly, and it will not be the response that the United States expects. It will be a response that will render the star wars program valueless.

[Shishlin] Viktor Nikolayevich, there is also the fact that, in addition to the purely military and defensive aspect of the matter, the problem of halting nuclear tests also has a great, very important and significant political aspect insofar as a positive response from the United States to the example of goodwill from the Soviet Union, its persevering and repeated example of goodwill, would signify even more than a breakthrough for trust. It would create the necessary political climate in whose conditions it would be possible to embark upon joint steps, joint actions, in reducing the level of military confrontation. And, you see, the foundation for this exists. It has, incidentally, been tended and prepared by the wide-ranging Soviet initiatives that embrace essentially all the key aspects connected with the limitation and curtailment of the arms race and first and foremost, of course, the nuclear arms race.

[Zorin] I would like to touch upon one factor. This is the calculations of the U.S. side to exhaust us economically. The events of recent days show how very shaky these calculations are. Only a few days ago there was a situation of panic, simply, when it emerged that a few hours remained before the U.S. would have to declare itself bankrupt. The treasury was empty. A session of the Senate was urgently convened, which gave permission to raise the ceiling of the state debt by almost \$250 billion. Where did this gaping hole in the budget come from? It is a boomerang. They are trying to exhaust us, but so far they have brought the country's financial system to an extremely acute, extremely critical situation.

Reagan has borrowed more than has been borrowed by all the preceding U.S. presidents together. This debt is to the major banks; the debt is to foreign corporations. It is

an enormous burden on the U.S. economy, which is fraught with very serious problems for all the economy as a whole. I believe that although now when we are reading the responses to Mikhail Sergeyevich's statement, the U.S. observers are not discussing this topic publicly -- it is too sore a topic -- I am convinced that behind closed doors influential business leaders are examining this aspect, and that it will also have an effect on how the U.S. position on this problem will be formed from now on.

[Levin] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed in his statement that he was appealing to the American people and to the U.S. President to heed the voice of reason. The Soviet Union is really offering one more opportunity. This opportunity is of enormous significance for all mankind. An observer of THE NEW YORK TIMES, Flora Lewis, recently wrote: Mikhail Gorbachev has convinced millions of people who are craving peace; Reagan has not, and this factor is having an effect.

Our peace-loving policy is characterized by its specific nature, its singleness of purpose; it is characterized by the fact that we are supporting our appeals and words with deeds. This cannot fail to produce a positive effect.

The time of our program has run out. Thank you for your attention, esteemed comrades. All the best.

PRAVDA Editorial

PM211123 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Aug 86 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Historic Chance"]

[Text] From time immemorial people have piously believed in the endless continuation of the human race. But the American atom bomb blasts in 1945 shook that faith, and the arms race unleashed by the United States and now taken to crazy lengths and the desire to transfer it into space have given rise to the worldwide conviction that the very existence of life on our planet is at stake. There is no more searing and troubling thought on earth now than the thought of the need to divert the threat of nuclear omnidestruction and to give mankind back its immortality. The time has come for decisive and responsible actions and the utmost mobilization of reason and common sense.

The statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on Soviet television is of exceptional significance in this connection. Today people throughout the world are studying and discussing it, perceiving it as an event of tremendous importance.

Having comprehensively and scrupulously weighed all the "pros" and "cons," and guided by responsibility for the destiny of peace, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the Government of the Soviet Union adopted a decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions through 1 January 1987.

The peoples evaluate highly and hail the USSR's new political initiative. The complete elimination of the most terrible instruments of destruction is the only way to genuine peace. The Soviet program to rid the entire earth of them by the year 2000, which fully accords with the demands of the age, has become the strategic aim of the peoples, and of political and public forces of the most diverse orientation and world outlook. More than a year ago the USSR was the first to take a bold and wise step on the way to that goal of all mankind by unilaterally introducing a moratorium on nuclear tests. Now it has been extended once again. This step marks the start of a new stage in the struggle to destroy nuclear weapons, curtail the arms race, and improve the international situation. This is how people of goodwill evaluate it.

In accordance with its program for the elimination of nuclear weapons, the USSR has placed a package of constructive proposals on the table at the Soviet-American talks. Together with its Warsaw Pact allies it has submitted a package of measures for the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Our new proposals make it possible to sign before the end of the year or next year a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and the elimination of their stocks and production base. The broad Soviet platform on ensuring security and cooperation in the Asia and Pacific region has also elicited a great response. The program for building a "star peace" has been submitted to the United Nations as an alternative to the "star wars" program. The principle of an all-embracing system of international security formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress were the most generalized expression of the new approaches in foreign policy.

The year of the moratorium has shown and elucidated a great deal. Above all, the pressure from peace-loving forces has increased. There has been an increase in the activity of a significant and authoritative section of the world community, including the "Delhi Six" -- the forum of leaders of countries on four continents -- and the majority of member states of the Nonaligned Movement. Moscow has received messages from politicians and public figures, from private individuals and organizations in many countries, including the United States and other NATO states, asking for the Soviet moratorium to be extended and for those who still insist on nuclear explosions to be given one more chance to see reason.

On the other hand, the year of the moratorium has enabled the world public to assess who really stands for disarmament and who is crazy about the arms race and to compare socialist morality with the "principles" of the money bag. The long silence on the Soviet nuclear test sites and the 18 explosions on the American sites constitute a contrast verbal tricks cannot conceal. During this time the admirers of nuclear weapons have also been deprived of excuses concerning the impossibility of verifying [kontrol] tests. All propaganda trappings have fallen from them. With their ostentatious scorn for world opinion and their defiant "responses" on the Nevada test site to the Soviet peace steps they would like to provoke us to draw us into new spirals of the arms race. But today -- and Washington should not forget this -- it is simply suicidal to build interstate relations on the illusion of achieving superiority in terms of the terrible instruments of destruction.

Soviet people know who they are dealing with. Therefore, the country's security is a sacred matter for us, and we will spare no effort for this. The Soviet Union's entire history attests to its ability to quickly find an answer to any challenge. [paragraph continues]

Let people on the other side of the ocean once again weigh the real value of the new military programs from the viewpoint of U.S. interests and security, the prospects for the Soviet-American talks, and the interests of world peace. We believe in the American people's reason and dignity and are sure that the ending of nuclear tests accords with their interests too and with the security of all peoples.

"The Soviet Union," M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his statement, "is sure that an agreement to end nuclear tests can be reached quickly and be signed already this year at a Soviet-American summit meeting. This event would undoubtedly be the chief result of the meeting and a significant step on the way to ending the arms race. It would be a kind of prologue to further progress at the talks on nuclear arms and their elimination and to the radical improvement of the entire situation in the world."

By extending its unilateral moratorium, the USSR is making one more weighty contribution to the common desire to ensure that International Peace Year goes down in

history as being worthy of its name. The governments and peoples of all countries, and the U.S. Administration and the American people above all, must not miss once again a historic chance on the way to ending the arms race.

Sokolov Address on Statement

PM210955 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Aug 86 Second Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent A. Belousov under the general heading "Strengthen the Motherland's Might": "To Safeguard Peace and Security"]

[Text] Firm support and fervent approval for the domestic and foreign policy of the party and the state and a readiness to make every effort to strengthen the country's defense might were expressed by personnel of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and main and central directorates of the USSR Defense Ministry at a rally dedicated to the statement on Soviet television by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The rally was opened by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister. He said that the statement provided a thorough analysis of the current situation in the world and confirmed, validated, and gave specific form to the fundamental provisions of our party's foreign policy as formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress. The Soviet Union's proposal on the unilateral extension of the moratorium on nuclear explosions is a manifestation of wisdom and a profound sense of responsibility for the fate of peace.

Such a foreign policy course, Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov stressed, meets the interests of Soviet people and all mankind. It finds unanimous support among all Soviet people and Army and Navy servicemen. It is welcomed by all people of good will, many social organizations, and the political circles of most countries.

The Soviet people and Army and Navy servicemen realize that the path to the attainment of mutual understanding will not be easy. The U.S. Administration does not want to alter its position. It is no coincidence that the statement stressed that we assess soberly the provision that the country's security is a sacred matter for us. We have the forces and the means to reliably safeguard the security of our country and of our allies.

The statement on Soviet television by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the Soviet Union's new political initiatives direct us toward further improving the personnel's combat training, increase the responsibility for ensuring reliable defense, and require the further increasing of the vigilance and combat readiness of the Army and the Navy. It is necessary to step up work to improve the management of troops at all levels and to persistently improve the organization and quality of Armed Forces' training. It is our particularly responsible task to comprehensively strengthen military discipline and increase the combat potential of the Armed Forces.

The rally was addressed by Army General V. Shabanov, USSR deputy defense minister; Colonel General I. Gashkov, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff; Colonel A. Chekulayev, party organization secretary of a directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; and Colonel General B. Byzov, chief of a directorate. The speakers expressed unanimous support for the party's foreign policy course and spoke about specific ways of increasing the effectiveness of work aimed at clarifying and propagandizing the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and at increasing the Soviet Armed Forces' vigilance and combat readiness.

'Top Priority'

LD211337 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 20 Aug 86

[From the "Top Priority" program presented by Vladimir Pozner with Doctors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of the United States of America and Canada Institute; in Moscow date not given -- recorded]

[Excerpts] [Pozner] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. This is Vladimir Pozner presenting "Top Priority." On the panel with me as usual are Doctors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of the institute for North American and Canadian studies here in Moscow, and the subject today I think is obvious. On Monday evening [18 August] the general secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Union's Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev, addressed the nation with a statement on the Soviet Union's decision to prolong the moratorium -- the unilateral moratorium -- on all nuclear tests until the end of 1986.

[Bogdanov] I'm really very happy that in our "Top Priority" we have been touching upon that subject several times now...

[Pozner, interrupting] Yes.

[Bogdanov, continuing] ... and we come again back to that subject, and I'm really very happy. So we have very consequent [as heard] foreign policy of the Soviet Union of unilateral action showing to everybody, and first of all to our (?respectable) USA, that we are very willing to cooperate and to find out the solution to the most acute problem of today, nuclear problem.

Now, if our listeners had an opportunity to listen to our secretary general or to read his statement, they would have noticed that how difficult it was for us, for our leadership, to make this decision. Difficult from many points of view, and let me call our listeners' attention to one very interesting fact, that even American military experts have recognized that now that hurts our military interests when we stop, again we prolong moratorium. And that is mankind you know, the whole problem looking even for the American side, very serious. Now, you will ask me that if it is serious, why several hours, literally speaking, several hours after the statement American side officially rejected that moratorium on many grounds, including one, that very usual one, propaganda ploy, but join us in that propaganda ploy; go the same way.

[Pozner] Let me interrupt you for just 1 second. [passage omitted] The question that comes up, that comes to mind, and I'd like to ask Dr Plekhanov about this, do you believe that this decision of ours can be interpreted by people in the United States in policy making positions as a sign of weakness?

[Plekhanov] Well, I don't think that wise people would interpret it this way, and I think that the majority viewpoint, even in the political circle is going to be different, in fact some of the preliminary reactions that we have heard here from abroad emphasize the wisdom of the Soviet step. Because really we are at a point where if we continue down the same road of the nuclear arms race and trying to outdo each other in amassing new and more powerful and more accurate nuclear weapons in the hope that, well, by doing that we will enhance our security, then sooner or later, and maybe not very long afterwards we are going to come to a very bad ending. It's going to be the end of everything.

So someone has to put a stop to this mad race to oblivion in which the world has been engaged in, and for 40 years.

And in that sense I think people recognize that if a country, if a major nuclear power -- one of the two biggest nuclear powers -- takes this step and continues to refrain for over a year from taking part in nuclear arms race, then that means that it is serious about stopping this race to oblivion. The very fact that yes, by testing we would have enhanced our nuclear capability but we choose not to do it. To give an example, because it's easy to give an example when you're not sacrificing anything, when you are sacrificing something that means you're serious, that means you really want to move in another direction.

[Pozner] Well then that's not propaganda.

[Plekhanov] That's clearly not propaganda.

[Pozner] Going back to what Dr Bogdanov said, I would like to ask you your opinion on some of the initial official American reactions. One is, and you've heard it before, that the United States continues to lag behind the Soviet Union and therefore has to do nuclear testing. What do you say to that?

[Bogdanov] Wait a minute, Vladimir. It is known now to everybody that USA had tested 275 times more, beginning from the nuclear era, than the Soviet Union.

[Pozner] Not 225 [as heard] times; but simply has tested 225 devices -- 40 percent more.

[Bogdanov] But if you add to that American allies' testing like nuclear tests of France and Britain then it comes to almost 60 percent more than the Soviet Union. So that you know argument has no ground; that argument is for uninformed public opinion. Let me say so, because if you deal with the hard facts you will see that the United States side is more ahead in the number of tests than the Soviet Union.

[Pozner] Gentlemen, you are (?politologists) and you have to be polite. I'm a journalist; I don't have to be polite. Therefore, would you agree with me without using that word that when the United States says that they lag behind the Soviet Union would you say that they are lying?

[Bogdanov] As a (?politologist) I would say just use that word. They are liars and falsifiers. All right, and I'm not ashamed of using that.

[Plekhanov] Well, that's a good political word after all.

[Pozner] All right, let's get to the next American argument, and that is that to stop nuclear testing is not in the national interests of the United States. What would you say to that?

[Plekhanov] Well, any politician, any political leader, has his, or any party has its own view of what national interests is all about. And if one defines the U.S. national interest as continuing to forego chances to stop the nuclear arms race, then I think other people should make the appropriate conclusions from it because it shouldn't be in any national, in any country's national interest to move toward suicide. And this is exactly what's happening. Now the problem is that we have lived with them -- and there are people who think that we cannot continue to do so. The problem is that we cannot, that the nuclear arms race is at a point where if it is allowed to continue down the same road, perhaps in 10, or 15, or 20 years there will be a nuclear war.

It's not just the numbers that are important, and of course there are far too many, but the characteristics of nuclear weapons, the military strategies, the configurations, the particular systems that are now being introduced into the game make the world look increasingly like a minefield, with a lot of mines and a lot of hair triggers in which it will be a very great likelihood that something might happen that will pull the trigger and we will all go. So this is something that is happening almost despite what people think, because people really are used to living with nuclear weapons (?and that) the argument that we haven't had a nuclear war for 50 years or 40 years and we can continue to go on like that; that's the major mistake.

[Bogdanov] Sergey, it sounds very convincing what you say. It sounds convincing for me, maybe for you, Vladimir. My question is how is this convincing for our friends over there? Sometimes, and particularly in these times, I feel a little bit desperate, you know, when I hear Larry Speakes say that national interests of USA to go along with the plan. You know what comes to my mind, that some of America's civilian politicians, instead of having -- you know -- human brains in their heads they already have nuclear reactors and they cannot generate but nuclear ideas. You know, they are so much poisoned by this nuclear, you know, (?aggressive) thinking that they feel, you know, scared if they will be deprived of that toy, you know, and maybe it has went so far as they will feel as without skin, you know. If they stop testing they lose their scarers [as heard], you know, in the eyes of the whole world.

[Pozner] I like the description but what comes to my mind is the famous statement of one of the, I believe he was the president or the chairman of the board of General Motors, who many many years ago said what's good for General Motors is good for America. [indistinct cross talk] Yeah, Charles Wilson, that's correct. I was thinking that perhaps from the viewpoint of the military industrial complex what's good for it, is good for America and obviously testing is in its interests.

[Bogdanov] You know, Vladimir, it's a very narrow view because, let me put it that way. God save us, of course, but if there is nuclear catastrophe what would be left to the military industrial complex? He will be the first victim of it, of that war. Where is the logic? Let me ask that.

[Pozner] Interestingly enough, among the arguments that are now cropping up in that sector of the United States against a nuclear test ban one seems to be somewhat absent and that's the argument about verification. It kind of seems to have slightly disappeared and I think it would be wise if one of you would kindly once again repeat for our listeners the Soviet position on verification, which has not been made very very clear to them by the American media, and also the concrete things that we've done in the area of verification here in the Soviet Union -- Semipalatinsk -- I think if you could give a brief description of that I think it would serve our purpose, Dr Plekhanov.

[Plekhanov] Verification was seen as a problem by the U.S. Government for quite some time. When both sides negotiated, and Britain, three powers negotiated a comprehensive test ban, there were such negotiations up until 1980, they agreed upon certain procedures which satisfied the concern over verification. But then the issue was reopened by the Reagan administration. They said oh, no, we can't go to the nuclear test ban because you can't verify it, there are possibilities that the Russians would cheat.

Now responsible experts always questioned that, but still the problem would not go away because there was so much rhetoric generated around it. I would call it the philistine side of the arms control because it sells very well with the uniformed people.

So we modified our position and the Soviet position now is that we are prepared for any kind of verification, including national technical means -- that means the listening stations that exist in the world -- and there are, I think, several hundred of them around the world -- then international verification techniques and the inspection of it on site -- on site inspection -- putting in the territories of each other devices, listening devices, which would be verifying the absence of tests, and if necessary sending experts to see what's going on. [passage omitted on current U.S.-USSR joint seismological experiment]

[Pozner] So the Americans invite us to verify their tests while our view is we invite you to verify the absence of tests.

[Bogdanov] Oh yes, oh yes.

[Pozner] Now we don't have very much time left so I'd like to ask you one question before we actually sign off, and that is what do you think the American reaction would have been, Dr Bogdanov, if General Secretary Gorbachev had announced that we will resume testing rather than prolong the moratorium?

[Bogdanov] Well, you know, I'm afraid that the American side would be very joyful because that would, you know, write off all their sins, let me put it like that.

[Pozner] Huge sighs of relief.

[Bogdanov] Huge sighs of relief. Yeah, you are right. But I don't feel like giving them that...

[Pozner interrupting] ...pleasure.

[Bogdanov, continuing] ...this pleasure because you know it's such a serious problem and it's such a chance really, opportunity. [passage omitted quoting Gorbachev on moratorium being a topic for summit discussion] So coming back to your question, while America would enjoy it -- I mean official America would enjoy it very much.

[Pozner] Now a final question. Do you think that the prolongation of the moratorium on the Soviet Union's part makes sense?

[Plekhanov] Oh, it certainly does. There's been a huge chorus in the world appealing to the Soviet Union to continue. People were saying: you are on the right course, please keep doing it, and we did respond even though it entailed sacrifices.

[Pozner] Do you have hope?

[Plekhanov] Hope for what?

[Pozner] Hope that ultimately the United States, because of public opinion perhaps, because there are people who think in the Senate, in the House. Do you think that there is a chance that they will, in fact, willy-nilly join in?

[Bogdanov] No, I'm afraid I'm pessimistic.

[Plekhanov] I think there is hope.

[Bogdanov] Well if you are right, I would enjoy it very much but still at this time I'm pessimistic.

[Pozner] Well I think we can all agree it's a historic moment. It's a possibility to really achieve a breakthrough in stopping the arms race, because nothing can stop it better than a nuclear test ban and that is also a major step along the way to going to the most important issue of all, and that is disarmament. So let us hope that this -- it's more than a gesture because it's a deed on the part of the Soviet Union -- will indeed prove, how should I put this, strong enough to make all leaders, all political leaders including the leadership of the United States, see the light of day and do what virtually all people want them to.

Dailies Carry Comments

PM211303 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 August 1986 in its First Edition carries on pages 1 and 4 under the general heading "Time for Responsible Actions" a feature rounding up reaction to Gorbachev's 18 August television statement.

The item begins with two letters of support, one from V. Zhuravlev, chief of the horticulture shop on Kazminskiy Kolkhoz in Stavropol Kray's Kochibeyevskiy Rayon; and the other from A. Chizhov, first secretary of the Mordovian ASSR Torbeyeyskiy Raykom. They are introduced by the following PRAVDA editorial note:

"PRAVDA continues to receive responses to M.S. Gorbachev's 18 August statement. They speak of the fact that Soviet people will be unsparing of their creative strength and labor energy for the sake of the triumph of peace-loving policy. Readers' letters and telegrams speak of the current pace of work, of how shock labor strengthens our motherland's defense might, and of the course of socialist competition for the successful fulfillment of targets for 1986 and the 5-year plan as a whole."

The following New York dispatch by PRAVDA's own correspondent V. Sukhoy is published under the headline "'We Are Fighting for Such a Treaty'":

"Thomas Joseph Downey has been representing the State of New York in the U.S. House of Representatives for 10 years. He is one of the youngest U.S. congressmen (he was 37 years old last January). A member of the Democratic Party, T. Downey is a politician of the new mold among U.S. legislators. Young, energetic, and realistic. He is a consistent opponent of the arms race and a champion of the SALT II treaty, advocating the achievement of a mutually acceptable verifiable U.S.-Soviet agreement that would substantially reduce the two countries' nuclear arsenals.

"Following the Soviet Union's announcement of a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions last year, T. Downey actively joined the struggle for the cessation of nuclear tests in the United States. Together with Congressmen P. Schroeder and E. Markey, he was one of the initiators of a House of Representatives amendment providing for the termination of appropriations for further nuclear tests at the Nevada testing ground. Back in March of this year, replying to a question by a journalist from the U.S. journal NUCLEAR NEWS about the prospects of such an amendment being passed, Downey expressed the view that the number of champions of the termination of nuclear tests will grow, both in the country as a whole and on Capitol Hill. If the administration fails to heed these demands and continues to explode nuclear charges, T. Downey said at that time, the House of Representatives will ultimately pass a resolution demanding an end to the financing of such a reckless policy.

"This is indeed what happened. On 8 August the House of Representatives passed a bill prohibiting the White House from conducting nuclear explosions with a yield in excess of 1 kiloton after 1 January 1987. T. Downey played a considerable role in ensuring that the bill was backed by the majority of congressmen.

"Your correspondent asked T. Downey for his opinion on the Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987. Here is what he said:

"Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, announced a decision that will undoubtedly make a major contribution to the cause of strengthening peace. I hope that my government will thoroughly weigh all the 'pros' and 'cons' and will ultimately respond in the same way.

"The House of Representatives has very clearly and unambiguously spoken in favor of the President's embarking on talks with the Soviet Union on the conclusion of an agreement for the all-embracing termination of nuclear tests. We congressmen believe that such an agreement can be reached before 1 January next years. Otherwise we will do everything possible to deprive the administration of funds for the conduct of large-yield nuclear tests. I want to emphasize once more that we are proceeding from the premise that the White House now has a unique opportunity to immediately sit down at the negotiating table with your country and, over the next 2-3 months, to reach a mutually acceptable agreement on the complete termination of nuclear tests.

"Unfortunately, the majority of senators believe that nuclear explosions are in the interest of our own security and the security of the whole world. There are, however, people even among them who disagree with this, and who are on the whole in favor of the termination of tests. Nonetheless, hitherto they have not gone as far as we, members of the House of Representatives, have gone. It is completely possible that the Soviet Union's decision to extend the moratorium on nuclear explosions will lead to many senators' reviewing of their stance. Should this happen, they will, first of all, attempt to convince the President to halt nuclear explosions.

"I always have been and will be an optimist. I am convinced that the termination of nuclear weapon tests is what all ordinary people want, what the peoples of our countries yearn for. If we were to agree on this issue, we would take a decisive step forward in the development of U.S.-Soviet relations. The treaty on the complete ban of all nuclear explosions is a commandment of common sense. We members of the House of Representatives are unwilling to deny our common sense, and this is why we are fighting for the conclusion of such a treaty. I imagine that soon we will all witness the onset of a new era, an era of silence at nuclear testing grounds."

In "Our Interview" by PRAVDA correspondent A. Krushinskiy carried under the headline "Policy of Humanism," Yordan Yotov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chief editor of RABOTNICHESKO DELO, says:

"The Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions until the end of this year is another vivid expression of our social system's humanism, of the persistence and consistency of the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

"The 18 August statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, attracts the attention of the entire world public and, in particular, enables it to perceive even more profoundly the incontrovertible truth that the USSR and the world socialist system are the most consistent fighters for mankind's salvation from thermonuclear catastrophe."

"On the other hand, the U.S. Administration's stubbornness in such an important matter as the nuclear moratorium graphically demonstrates the essential features of imperialism. At the same time I hope, I would like to believe, that the United States and its allies will at long last manage to retreat from their obstructionist policy on the question of

the termination of nuclear explosions -- after all, if they do not do this they will finally expose themselves before the world public as enemies of peace on earth, as the worst enemies of human civilization.

"The Soviet leader's statement formulates vividly and with sound arguments the common stance and the joint coordinated foreign policy line of Warsaw Pact countries. A line expressing the fundamental interests of all of mankind, because currently the question concerns not just the fate of a certain stratum of population or a social class, but also the salvation of life on earth!"

Yu. Kuznetsov offers the following "Rejoinder," published under the headline "Where the Subtlety Lies....":

"What would you, readers, describe as gentle (and at the same time subtle) British humor? We-e-ll, you would say, instances of someone speaking (or writing) in a humorous vein, but also with propriety. Without going over: a) into matters of personality, and b) the borderline of common sense. Examples? Easy. Take the unforgettable Jerome K. Jerome as one.

"Why have we raised this issue? We had to. One needs, after all, some sort of criterion to evaluate London's response to our country's latest decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until 1 January 1987.

"London's Foreign Office declared (evidently with subtle British humor) that the moratorium is apparently 'not the best way' to reach agreement in the arms control sphere.

"It seems that certain people in London firmly believe that in order to exercise effective arms control is it necessary to build up arms by all means. Iron logic! (Uranium logic as well, of course.) Therefore, in connection with the extension of the nuclear moratorium, this venerable institution expressed... what do you think? 'Regrets.'

"See? Subtly put. And mainly -- with propriety. Just think: Explosion upon explosion in Nevada. No regrets. The Pentagon lot is whipping up the arms race and building up tension. Zero regrets. 'Star wars?' What is there to feel sorry about? The poor old earth?...

"No, do forgive me -- this is no longer out of Jerome's 'Three Men in a Boat (excluding the dog).' It belongs rather to the realm of malevolent paradoxes. Oh, Mr O. Wilde! Even you are far inferior in this realm, far inferior from your compatriots of today, whose forebears you taught how important it is to be earnest.

"Just think: Responses to the moratorium's extension are now coming from all over the world. But -- as we can see -- there are also some like the aforementioned response. The ultimate result of some desire (striving, or passionate dream) to discredit at all cost any initiative of ours simply because it is a Soviet initiative.

"Could it, nevertheless, be worth recalling how important it is to be earnest when the issue concerns really earnest matters?"

A column under the headline "From the Newspapers" consists of a 100-word extract from L'HUMANITE and the following report on RENMIN RIBAO's response, both published beneath the relevant newspaper's banner:

"Soviet leader M.S. Gorbachev has announced that his country is extending the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until 1 January 1987, according to a XINHUA report published by this newspaper.

"In his statement that was broadcast by TASS, he criticized the United States for having 'exploded a further 18 nuclear devices' while the Soviet moratorium was in force, noting that 3 of them had not been reported. The U.S. foreign policy 'despite all its twists and turns and verbal dressing up, is like before built upon dangerous delusions: underestimation of the Soviet Union... and overestimation of its own potential,' M.S. Gorbachev declared. He stressed that for Soviet people the Soviet Union's security is 'a sacred cause' and 'a question of principle.'

"He declared that his country is prepared to respond to 'any challenge by the United States, including the notorious SDI.'

"If need be, we will swiftly find an answer, and it will not be the one expected by the United States,' the Soviet leader warned.

"Local observers are of the opinion that, by extending the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests, M.S. Gorbachev calculates on exerting pressure on the U.S. Administration to gain certain concessions on the question of terminating nuclear tests during his second meeting with U.S. President Reagan in Washington this year. Some observers in Moscow note that M.S. Gorbachev's statement gave them the impression that an agreement on the termination of nuclear tests could be reached at the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting."

The remainder of PRAVDA's feature consists of the following items:

A 200-word statement by David Chavez, seismologist from the University of Reno, Nevada, datelined Karkaralinsk, Kazakh SSR, and published under the headline "The Instruments Register Silence...." Chavez expresses his "full support" for the moratorium's extension, describing it as an "inspiring example."

A 1,000-word column under the headline "Statements, Responses, Evaluations," consisting of a Hanoi report by PRAVDA's own correspondent V. Potapov on Truong Chinh's statement that the Vietnamese people "ardently acclaim and fully support" Gorbachev's statement; five TASS dispatches dated 20 August and datelined New York, Pyongyang, Athens, Stockholm, and Mexico City, reporting favorable responses by UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, the DPRK Foreign Ministry, the Greek Government, Swedish Prime Minister Carlsson, and the Mexican Government.

A 250-word TASS dispatch, datelined New York, 20 August, reporting a telegram sent to Gorbachev by Prof B. Lown.

The last item in PRAVDA's feature is a 100-word unattributed report on Australian Radio's reaction to the Gorbachev statement.

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 August 1986 Morning Edition carries on page 4 a feature on the same subject under the general heading "The Soviet Moratorium and the World," consisting of the following items:

A 250-word statement by Prof Manfred von Ardenne, GDR scientist and People's Chamber deputy; a 500-word interview with Prof Shigeyoshi Matsumae, chairman of the Japanese Association for Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries; a 150-word unattributed statement by Senator Edward Kennedy; a 200-word unattributed report on Prof B. Lown's telegram to Gorbachev; a 100-word unattributed report on Swedish Prime Minister Carlsson's

statement; a 300-word "TASS correspondent" Warsaw dispatch reporting a Polish Government's statement read at a Warsaw press conference; a 150-word unattributed report on statement by UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar; and a 700-word article by Melor Sturua, entitled "Haste Makes Waste," satirizing the response by Britain's Foreign Office.

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 August 1986 Second Edition front-pages a feature under the heading "To Strengthen the Motherland's Might," introduced by the following boxed note:

"Meetings of personnel are currently taking place within the Soviet Armed Forces, whose participants ardently approve and unanimously support the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and declare their readiness to strengthen the motherland's defense might through their selfless military labor."

The feature consists of a 700-word report by correspondent Colonel A. Belousov, entitled "To Ensure Peace and Security," covering a meeting at the Ministry of Defense addressed by Marshal S. Sokolov, Army General V. Shabanov, and others; a 250-word report by Guards Lieutenant Colonel V. Kazanskiy datelined Northern Group of Forces, entitled "The Tank Crews' Word" and covering a meeting held at the Orsha Guards Tank Regiment; and a 250-word report by Captain 2d Rank V. Krikunov, commander of the cruiser "Slava," entitled "We Support and Approve," covering a meeting held on the missile cruiser "Slava" "here, in the Mediterranean."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial

PM221007 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Aug 86 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "A Policy of Realism and Peace"]

[Text] Millions of people of goodwill throughout the planet received with tremendous satisfaction the statement on Soviet television by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in which the basic principles of the new approach to international affairs that define the course of Soviet foreign policy were precisely formulated once again. This policy is built on an understanding of profound changes in the world. The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that war can no longer be a means of attaining political objectives. In the nuclear age it is totally unacceptable. The adherence of socialism as a social system to the cause of peace and a realization of its responsibility for the destiny of civilization are vividly expressed in the USSR's foreign policy. This policy is approved and supported by the socialist community countries and by progressive mankind.

The contemporary world is becoming increasingly interdependent and integrated. In our age, saving the world from nuclear perdition is a task for all mankind, a matter for all people. And only having pooled the efforts of all states and peoples can exacerbated global problems be solved. Our age demands the maximum mobilization of wisdom and common sense. The very existence of the human species is now at stake. The time has come for resolute and responsible actions.

The Soviet Union's extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987 is such a resolute and responsible step. In making this decision, the Soviet Union proceeded from the premise that the ending of nuclear tests not only by the USSR, but also by the United States, would be a real breakthrough toward a suspension [priostanovka] of the nuclear arms race, and would accelerate the elimination of nuclear arms. Such a measure, were it to be supported by other nuclear

powers, would promote the improvement of the international climate and would strengthen trust in mutual relations among states. The ending of nuclear tests would inspire faith that the arms race can be stopped, it would facilitate the attainment of agreements on the reduction of nuclear weapons, and would stimulate the whole disarmament process.

Resolute actions, specific measures aimed at ending the arms race and going over to real disarmament, are now more necessary than ever before. The efforts of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community are directed at the quickest solution of this task. Their actions in the international arena are dictated by serious alarm for the destiny of peace and by concern for the future of people. The fundamentals of an all-embracing system of international security were formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress. The question of the creation of such a system was recently submitted officially by a group of socialist countries for examination by the next session of the UN General Assembly. The Soviet proposals of 15 January this year concerning the elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world by the year 2000 fully accord with the demands of the age. The Soviet Union and the other member-states of the Warsaw Pact have proposed a package of measures for the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. New proposals have been submitted on chemical weapons. The socialist states are pursuing a constructive line at the Stockholm conference. The Soviet Union has come forward with a broad platform for ensuring security and cooperation in the Asian and Pacific region. These and many other foreign policy initiatives by the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community constitute new thinking in action. They create a real opportunity for untying the tight knot of world problems.

However, all these obvious and encouraging manifestations of new thinking are being opposed -- above all in the United States -- by the militarization of political thinking which has, among the West's ruling circles, so dangerously lagged behind the process of profound changes in international life. The right-wing militarist group in the United States that represents the mighty military industrial complex has simply gone crazy on the arms race, pursuing here a triple [as published] objective: to prevent a dwindling of the flow of profits from the production of weapons; to ensure U.S. military superiority; to try to exhaust the Soviet Union economically and weaken it politically; and finally to guarantee commanding positions in the world and to carry out far-reaching imperial ambitions.

Some people in the West are trying to build interstate relations on the dangerous illusion of attaining superiority in terms of the terrible instruments of annihilation. Forces are energetically operating in the United States who do not want to disarm at all. Moreover, they are doing everything to draw the Soviet Union and other socialist countries into more and more spirals of the arms race and to provoke a breakdown of negotiations. Though having held the lead in terms of the number of nuclear explosions for 4 decades, the United States has detonated during the year of the Soviet moratorium 18 nuclear devices, 3 of which were not announced. At the same time this was done, as a rule, in an ostentatious fashion, the tests being timed to coincide with the latest Soviet statement on the extension of the moratorium or else to coincide with some other particular peace initiative by the USSR. And yet, despite all the provocations, the Soviet Union, having comprehensively weighed all the "pros" and "cons" and guided by responsibility for the destiny of peace, has deemed it possible to prolong the silence at its own nuclear proving grounds for a further period of over 4 months. [paragraph continues]

This provided yet another chance for the U.S. Administration to seriously evaluate all the dangerous consequences that the continuation of nuclear tests entails.

The Soviet proposals stem from the realities of the modern world. They are dictated not by weakness but by consciousness of a lofty responsibility for the fate of mankind. At the same time the Soviet Union is not slackening its vigilance in the face of imperialism's incessant aggressive intrigues. "The security of the country," the CPSU Central Committee's general secretary firmly asserted, "is a sacred matter for us. This must be clear to all. It is a question of principle. We proceed from this premise when responding to any challenges from the United States, including the notorious SDI. And here too, let no one count on intimidating us or pushing us into unnecessary expenditure. If need be, we will quickly find a response and not the kind of response that the United States expects. But it will be a response that will negate the value of the 'star wars' program."

Mankind is now faced with a historic choice: To permit a slide along the path of confrontation and the arms race toward the abyss of nuclear self-destruction, or to bring one's way of thinking and acting into line with the realities of the nuclear and space age. The Soviet Union's moratorium on nuclear explosions is not just a proposal. It is a resolute and responsible action that proves in deeds the seriousness and sincerity of the Soviet nuclear disarmament program and of the Soviet appeals for a new policy -- the policy of realism, peace, and cooperation.

Impact on Peace Movement Noted

LD211336 Moscow TASS in English 1051 GMT 21 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow, August 21 TASS -- It is only by the joint efforts of different sections of the anti-war movement in the West and the East that it is possible to achieve success in the struggle against the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, Yuriy Zhukov, the well-known publicist, chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee, said in a TASS interview.

After noting that the Soviet public is fully aware of its share of responsibility for the destinies of peace and mankind, Yuriy Zhukov said: "We know that in the West, too, the United States included, the forces demanding peace and disarmament are growing more active. We extend a hand of cooperation to all people of goodwill." It is necessary to act now, and act vigorously and together, he stressed.

Zhukov said that reports of meetings by peace champions, fully approving Mikhail Gorbachev's televised statement of August 18, are coming these days from all parts of the Soviet Union. Soviet people stress that the USSR's decision to prolong its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions till January 1, 1987, was prompted by a high sense of responsibility for the destinies of the world. The Soviet Union took this move in order to give the White House one more chance to adopt a policy for ending the arms race.

The Soviet peace supporters, Yuriy Zhukov said, urge all people who hold dear peace and mankind's future to take resolute and responsible actions to put an end to the nuclear weapons tests and bring about an earliest conclusion of an agreement on the termination of such tests.

Moscow Gorispolkom Press Conference

LD212035 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 21 Aug 86

[Report by Moscow Radio correspondent Olga Vasilenko]

[Excerpt] The press conference was opened by Yuriy Anatolyevich (Prokofyev), secretary of the Moscow Gorispolkom. He mainly spoke about the numerous meetings being held

these days here in the capital. He described what the participants in the meetings are talking about, and what is the subject of their appeal to all the world's people:

[Begin (Prokofyev) recording] At the meetings and gatherings that took place at the Likhachev works, the Imeni Pyatidesyatiletia SSR Automatic Lines Works, the Moskabel Works, the Tushino Hosiery Plant, the Mosfilm Studio, and a number of others, it was proposed to appeal, on behalf of the people of Moscow, to the inhabitants of world capitals to support the USSR peace initiative contained in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement. In connection with the numerous wishes of the working people and inhabitants of the city, the Moscow soviet was approached by representatives of a number of the city's public organizations, who proposed the holding on Saturday, 23 August, of mass demonstrations and meetings, and the drafting of an address to the inhabitants of world capitals and cities with which Moscow maintains friendly ties, calling on them to become the initiators of the development of a mass movement in their countries to nuclear weapons tests and create an all-embracing system of international security. [end recording]

Then journalists were addressed by representatives of public organizations: The Moscow Committee for the Defence of Peace, the Committee for the Capital's Youth Organizations, the Moscow City Council of Trade Unions. Vasily Nikiforovich (Gorelov), senior secretary of the Moscow section of the War Veterans' Council, began his address with an account of a meeting held by Moscow war veterans. [passage omitted -- (Gorelov) wholeheartedly supports Gorbachev's announcement of the moratorium, constantly referring to the experience of World War II].

Scientists Support Stand

LD210726 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 21 Aug 86

[Text] At the microphone is Boris Nikolayevich Naumov, director of the Informatics Problems Institute and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences:

It was with great satisfaction that we received Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement on extension of the moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987. Soviet scientists, like all the Soviet public, have repeatedly advocated, advocate and will continue to advocate an end to these tests. Our main aim is that all of our work, everything that we do, be subordinated to our peaceful tasks, which were posed by the 27th CPSU Congress. We strive to have all our work improve the conditions of our life and improve cooperation among countries. Our country has lived through a great deal, and it knows what war means. The Americans do not know what war means. Rejection of our proposal will lead to a catastrophe: this has already been spoken of repeatedly, and not only by scientists. Today every schoolchild understands that if there is a nuclear war, there will be no victors; mankind will be destroyed. We hope that both Mr Reagan and all of the U.S. public will properly appraise Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement, will think again and will adopt the correct decision -- that they will meet our proposals on ending nuclear tests halfway.

Workers, Academician Pleased

LD191754 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 19 Aug 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] Gorbachev's TV statement was welcomed by the Soviet people. Before the morning shift at Moscow enterprises there were brief meetings in support of the

statement. At the Krasnyy Proletariy Works a meeting unanimously approved the Soviet decision.

Viktor Ivanovich Trefilov, vice-president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, seated in his study, is interviewed. He says: "The series of consistent, carefully considered and responsible proposals by our country, directed at nuclear disarmament, overall disarmament and that the destruction of chemical weapons, is in keeping with the deepest aspirations of mankind and is capable of guaranteeing mankind its future."

After commenting on how much mankind wants disarmament, Trefilov continues: "I think the extension of the moratorium on nuclear tests, the decision taken by our Soviet Government and the party Central Committee, is not just a proposal. It is an action, a concrete action directed at the defense of peace and at halting the arms race."

"Unfortunately, the U.S. Administration has not yet given a constructive reply to our country's proposals. I think that in the actions of the U.S. Administration one can observe a familiar reappraisal of its possibilities, including its technological possibilities. Nowadays technological snobbery is extremely dangerous. Our country possesses a gigantic scientific and scientific-technical potential. Soviet scientists have repeatedly proved their ability to outstrip considerably the scientific work of the Western countries. Remember, the space age was born in the Soviet Union. The development of the scientific-technical revolution and human genius have released gigantic forces of nature, and in a number of cases we are still just learning fully to master these gigantic new potentials."

"The two tragedies Mikhail Sergeyevich mentioned, the catastrophe of the Challenger and the accident at the Chernobyl AES show how far we still are from fully mastering these forces. The situation is truly very complex. Even in such strictly monitored and controlled conditions they can still nevertheless get out of control, so an attempt to use these giant forces to destroy mankind is truly a most serious crime."

IPPNW Chairman Lauds Gorbachev

LD200957 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0901 GMT 20 Aug 86

[Text] New York, 20 Aug (TASS) -- B. Lown, joint chairman of the international movement "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" [IPPNW] and professor at Harvard University, has sent a telegram to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in which he welcomes the Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987.

The telegram says: "On behalf of the doctors of the whole world, today I thank you and give you your due for an act of enormous state wisdom. By again extending the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests and again calling on the Americans to follow your example, you have made an important step toward delivering the world from nuclear weapons."

"In our nuclear age you frequently call for a new way of thinking. Your decision is a graphic demonstration of adherence to such thinking. I think history will record that a widespread popular movement of all countries to put an end to the madness of the nuclear arms race, and I consider that your leadership is furthering this movement and giving it new strength."

"Now our task is to convince the American people and their representatives that a mutual Soviet-U.S. ban on nuclear explosions is in accordance with the interests of the United States, and also the interests of all states. We American doctors must convince

our fellow-citizens that in this issue national patriotism and universal humanism merge into a single powerful stream. I believe that we will achieve success, and I know that we owe a great deal to your leadership and your example".

U.S. Stand Lamented

LD212038 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 21 Aug 86

[Boris Andrianov commentary]

[Text] Our country's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests has revived the hopes of all people of goodwill who want to see the planet at peace. This is shown by the overwhelming majority of foreign responses to the Soviet Union's new political initiative. It is praised and welcomed by people throughout the world. They are convinced once again of the honesty and consistency of Soviet foreign policy. The international public is witnessing bold and wise steps by the Soviets along the only path to genuine peace -- the complete elimination of these most terrible instruments of annihilation.

Such concrete acts by the Soviet Union serve, for peace-loving humanity, as a model for the manifestation of political will, profound humanism and high responsibility for the destiny of mankind in our nuclear age. This position of reason and common sense accords fully with the demands of the times. It is not surprising that it meets with growing support on all continents, and it is this fact that is now giving rise to concern in Western circles, primarily in the United States, where the militarization of political thinking has occurred. There, they feel the pressure of peace-loving forces, and, at the same time they experience the urge to continue the arms race, over which the military-industrial complex has simply gone mad. In this connection, the British FINANCIAL TIMES noted that Moscow had enlisted considerable international support and put the Americans in an even more difficult position. This, presumably, refers to the right-wing militarist group in the United States, which is the source of the attempts by official Washington to play down the sense of the Soviet Union's new initiative and belittle the importance of our country's decision to extend the duration of the unilateral moratorium.

What is one to make of the intention to depict the decision as an exclusively personal matter for the Russians -- that is, as though it had nothing to do with one of the most important international problems? And when this interpretation rebounded on its authors, the State Department declared that a moratorium on nuclear tests is not, as it claimed in the interests of U.S. security and that of its allies. This once again exposed U.S. politicians' reluctance to reckon with the objective reality, which is that today it is impossible to ensure one's own security without taking into account the security of other states and peoples. The path to universal security is laid by the struggle to ban nuclear weapons, and the first step toward this objective is a moratorium on nuclear explosions.

It is not fortuitous that, in their propaganda, U.S. ruling circles handle the matter in such a way that, as Tanzanian President Nyerere said: Americans know practically nothing either about the Soviet moratorium or about the program for eliminating nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, as is shown by public opinion polls, the vast majority of Americans are in favor of quickly reaching Soviet-U.S. agreements that will enable the senseless nuclear arms race to be ended and provide the world's people with the opportunity to relax. The only obstacle is the rigid position of the White House, which stubbornly avoids replying to the Soviet Union's concrete and constructive proposals.

Japanese Reaction Cited

LD201433 Moscow TASS in English 1248 GMT 20 Aug 86

["Soviet Test Moratorium -- Japan" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Tokyo August 20 TASS -- Japan welcomes the Soviet Union's extension of its unilateral nuclear test moratorium until January 1, 1987, a highly placed official of the Japanese Foreign Ministry announced here today.

He emphasised that the United States should undertake steps jointly with the Soviet Union in order to end all nuclear tests.

Japanese CD Delegation Comments

PM201506 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 August 1986 Morning Edition carries on page 4 a 500-word TASS correspondent New York dispatch, a 500-word V. Kuznetsov Geneva dispatch, and a 300-word V. Antonov Brussels dispatch under the general heading "Moscow: Another Historic Chance. The New Soviet Initiative At the Center of Attention of the World Public," citing positive responses to the latest Soviet initiative to extend its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests until January 1987, including the following response from Dr (Ruikiti Imai), head of the Japanese delegation at the Geneva Disarmament Conference:

"I awaited the Soviet leadership's decision on the question of the moratorium with great impatience. This problem has perhaps become the key problem, the touchstone by which states' attitude to the questions of peace and security is gauged. It is also the focus of real possibilities to slow down and ultimately end the nuclear arms race. There are also philosophical problems here -- our attitude toward the future. What will this future be? An interval between new, more sophisticated threats of nuclear catastrophe or a world free of nuclear weapons? This problem is being decided now, and the question of ending all types of nuclear tests must be resolved without delay.

"Some say that the Soviet moratorium is propaganda. But, first, in conditions where the nuclear missile balance and the questions of defending national interests are most important for states to survive, so many months without conducting tests cannot be propaganda. And, second, why should others not engage in the same kind of propaganda and cease all nuclear tests? It is also said that the means of monitoring nuclear tests are inadequate. We have also heard this kind of approach and statements like these here in Geneva at the Disarmament Conference. But the fact that the Soviet Union has registered three unannounced U.S. explosions during the moratorium is perfect evidence that the problems of monitoring can be successfully resolved using national means. The results of work done by a group of seismologists within the conference framework are also convincing in this respect."

"These results attest that there are no technical obstacles to detecting nuclear explosions. The Japanese delegation has put forward its own proposals on monitoring issues which, in conjunction with on-site inspection and verification, to which the Soviet Union has agreed, create real potential for concluding an agreement on ending nuclear tests and signing it this year.

"The new approach of the Soviet leadership to this cardinal problem is a reflection of its comprehensive efforts to improve the situation in all regions. I personally am seriously concerned that the arms race may also spread to the Pacific Ocean region and that nuclear weapons will become a means of blackmail and a means of implementing plans for political, economic, and military superiority in this extensive region. That is why M. S. Gorbachev's recent speech in Vladivostok is an extended hand of friendship, mutual understanding, and cooperation for sake of resolving global problems and overcoming suspicion and mistrust in Asia. The time has come for dialogue, an end to confrontation, and understanding of our common responsibility for the future of our planet."

PRAVDA Reviews Reaction

PM200934 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 20 August 1986 in its First Edition devotes considerable space to domestic and foreign reaction to General Secretary Gorbachev's 18 August announcement of an extension of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests. PRAVDA's roundup of reaction occupies two-thirds of the right-hand four columns of the front page and two-thirds of the left-hand five columns of page 4.

The roundup begins by citing Soviet citizens' letters and remarks approving the extension. One letter is from Belorussian writer Ivan Shamyakin, who declares: "Our motherland has again really demonstrated its peace-loving policy and concern for the security of all mankind." He expresses support for the "great restructuring" under way in Soviet life, stating that: "More than ever before, the Central Committee, party organs, and soviets at all levels are widely informing working people and carefully heeding public opinion." He cited the Politburo resolution stopping work on the project to divert Siberian rivers as an instance of this responsiveness to public opinion.

PRAVDA's roundup continues with a 1,100-word 19 August New York dispatch from own correspondent G. Vasilyev, headlined "Tremendous Impression." He summarizes initial U.S. reaction as "approval and support from sober-minded Americans and irritation and resentment on the part of right-wingers and representatives of the military-industrial complex." He noted that the major U.S. television networks led their evening newscasts with reports on Gorbachev's statement and writes: "In the opinion of the leading television companies, experts invited to the studios, and politicians who could be found in the capital (it is the time of the summer vacation now in Washington), the thoughts on peace and ways of curbing the arms race voiced by the Soviet leader have met with a broad positive response in the United States."

With regard to U.S. political reaction to the statement so far, Vasilyev writes: "Americans, so Senator E. Kennedy said, welcome the new Soviet peace initiative set out in M.S. Gorbachev's statement. But what about the U.S. Administration, the people who have recently been trying to persuade people that they seriously want constructive Soviet-American dialogue? They have again rejected out of hand the suggestion that they join the Soviet moratorium. White House spokesman L. Speakes, who is temporarily ensconced with his master at his ranch in Santa Barbara, declared that the White House had not yet read the Soviet statement. However, he remarked: 'The prohibition of nuclear tests does not accord with the security interests of the United States or its friends and allies.' Thus the leaders of the U.S. Republican administration have again demonstrated the worth of their 'peacemaking' statements.

"Commenting on Speakes' remark, NBC White House correspondent A. Mitchell explained most cynically that the prohibition of nuclear explosions does not suit the U.S. Administration because it would prevent the Pentagon from testing nuclear charges for the D-5 missiles for submarines, the 'Midgetman' mobile missiles, and nuclear devices for laser weapons in the 'star wars' program."

Vasilyev goes on the quote favorable comment on the moratorium extension from representatives of U.S. antiwar organizations. The roundup also included brief interviews with leaders of Bulgarian and Canadian antiwar organizations and a chronology contrasting the history of the Soviet test moratorium with the U.S. nuclear test program over the same period.

PRC Press Cited

LD211349 Moscow TASS in English 1329 GMT 21 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 21 TASS -- All leading Chinese newspapers, quoting XINHUA reports, have published materials on the statement of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev, as well as international comments on it, TRUD's Beijing correspondent says in his dispatch published in the newspaper today.

The newspaper RENMIN RIBAO, the correspondent writes, has printed the statement under the double caption: "The Soviet Union prolongs its moratorium on nuclear explosions. The USA asserts that cessation of nuclear tests is not in its national security interests."

Chinese mass media make special note of the Soviet proposal for signing an agreement on ending nuclear tests already this year at a Soviet-American summit meeting.

The English-language CHINA DAILY writes in this connection that the United States' refusal to accede to the Soviet moratorium is to be explained not only by its desire to continue perfecting offensive nuclear arms. American officials say frankly in private conversations, the newspaper stresses, that the Pentagon needs continued nuclear tests for working on its "Star Wars" programme in the hope of gaining a considerable military advantage over the Soviet Union.

An official spokesman for the Chinese foreign ministry, answering questions at a press conference, said that the Chinese side hopes that the two great nuclear powers would find a way of ending the testing, manufacture and deployment of nuclear weapons and come to terms on a considerable reduction of their nuclear potentials in order to achieve effective nuclear disarmament, the TRUD correspondent reports.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1527

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW TV ROUND TABLE DISCUSSES MORATORIUM ISSUE

LD020406 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 1 Aug 86

[From "The Alternative" program; round table discussion presented by Prof Sergey Petrovich Kapitsa with Dr Theodore Taylor, U.S. scientific consultant; Prof Carlo Bernardini, Italian physicist; Dr Ram (Subramanian), Indian physicist with the Institute of Strategic Studies; and Prof Hans-Peter Duerr, scientist and director of an institute of the FRG Max Planck Institutes and professor at Munich University; Kapitsa introduction in Russian and remainder of round table in English with superimposed Russian translation; date and place not given; live or recorded]

[Text] [Kapitsa] Good afternoon. Our program today is devoted to the very serious subject, the subject of ending nuclear tests. The international Forum of Scientists for Nuclear Test Ban gathered in Moscow to discuss this issue. This forum was convened by an international group. It took place in Moscow from 11 to 13 July. Attending it were perhaps the leading specialists and scientists from many countries who were concerned about this problem, the problem of ending nuclear tests, of ending nuclear tests as a step toward ending, in the first place the race involving the most dangerous strategic types of weapons. This, indeed, is the subject to which we want to devote our conversation and discussion today.

In effect, we will repeat to a certain extent what took place at the forum itself. We have gathered together a number of major scientists to take part in this discussion. On my left is Dr Theodore Taylor. He is presently a scientific consultant with a firm engaged in the development of various scientific and technical projects. This man is noteworthy on account of the fact that essentially as a young scientist, he became a worker in one of the major laboratories for the development of nuclear weapons. Very quickly he became, effectively, the main author of what is called the second generation of nuclear weapons, in which, following the first, fairly crude and primitive by present-day standards, a second generation was invented; it is much more destructive, much more compact and cheap, essentially a means of waging nuclear war capable of destroying everything. He stood perhaps at the summit of the pyramid of science and technology that created these weapons in the United States. Now, after what I would call his tempestuous youth, he has changed his point of view and has become -- having understood very deeply what nuclear weapons are -- a very active participant in explaining what they bring to people and the threat they represent to mankind. Prof Carlo Bernardini is a famous Italian physicist who was also engaged in different questions concerning high-energy physics not connected with the problems of nuclear energy. But, he is a widely-educated scientist who was also a senator -- I think you were a senator at one time and now you... [previous phrase in English]

[Bernardini, interrupting] Just for a short time.

[Kapitsa] This perhaps reflects his interest in issues that go beyond the limits of purely physics problems. Dr Ram (Subramanian) is a colleague of ours from India. He is a physicist, too, he has been engaged in problems of theoretical physics and is now an analyst at the Institute of Strategic Studies. He, too, now devotes perhaps most of his attention not so much to physics as to scientific and social problems. Prof Hans-Peter Duerr is a famous West German Scientist, director of an institute within the system of Max Planck Institutes in West Germany, engaged in problems of theoretical physics and astrophysics. He is also a professor at Munich University, one of the major and most renowned universities in the country. So, we have here people of different origins, I would say, who have done different things in their lives and who come from different countries. I think that in this way we can best encompass the entirety of the complex and integrated problem that I would like us to examine today.

[Taylor] Well I am very grateful to be part of this forum that is devoted to problems linked with the serious danger now hanging over all of mankind. At this forum, we have discussed the actions we can take in order to prevent that threat. I am perhaps more concerned than many people by the question of what might take place if nuclear weapons tests continue. A large number of possibilities that are not yet known to us exist for using new types of nuclear weapons, the atomic bomb, and the second generation, the hydrogen bomb. Now, we are already talking about a third generation.

[Kapitsa] In a certain way are you implicated in the third generation of weapons?

[Taylor] Well, only to a slight extent. I only took part in improvement work on the first type of the weapons, when we were trying to make them smaller. I took virtually no part in developing the hydrogen bomb. Currently, steps are being taken toward using nuclear weapons in open space. This is an important part of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, star wars, an antimissile defense that can be intensified through the use of nuclear weapons. The third generation of nuclear weapons has a much greater energy reserve and at the same time a greater directivity.

[Kapitsa] Weak shortwave radiation exists in space.

[Taylor] In open space, the possibilities for the distribution of radiation of all kinds, including gamma rays and neutrons, in any direction are limitless. There is no air there; there is no atmosphere. nothing exerts a brake on the gamma rays and the neutrons.

[Kapitsa] This only concerns the shortwave radiation.

[Taylor] If shortwaves are distributed through the atmosphere they warm it up. There exist, however, dozens of different forms of energy that are released as a result of a nuclear explosion, that can be sent in a fixed direction. I have given the following analogy. You can kill an animal with a bomb instead of shooting it with a gun. In so doing, a quantity of energy thousands of times greater than used with the bullet would be spent pointlessly. The third generation of nuclear weapons can be compared with a Pandora's box, which still contains a great deal of evil. I insist that everything possible be done in order not to open this box.

[Kapitsa] In a certain sense, this is reminiscent of the situation in 1972 when the agreement on limiting antimissile defense means was signed.

[Taylor] I think that is right. Tests play a substantial role in the development of ballistic missiles. You cannot talk seriously about an antimissile defense system

without testing new types of missiles. Obviously, new types of weapons that are designed differently need verification tests first.

[Kapitsa] Yes. This is the field of experimental physics.

[Taylor] Yes, a lot is done by computers. But they work satisfactorily if there are no serious changes. Each new innovation has to be tested. Thus, having ended tests we will be able to put an end to the invention of new types of weapons, and consequently we will hamper the further growth of the senseless quantity of nuclear weapons already amassed in the world.

[Kapitsa] We know the tragic consequences of their use, which amount to the complete destruction of our environment.

[Taylor] Nuclear weapons bring death to mankind. No one today doubts the threat that nuclear war poses for all living things. The conference approved a treaty banning all nuclear tests. In my view, it is particularly important that the conference is taking place now, at a time when the Soviet Union has been operating under a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests for a year. By its behavior, the Soviet Union is calling upon the United States and the other nuclear powers to follow its example. This initiative is very important for universal security and I very much hope that the Soviet Union will not step back and will urge on toward measures in response.

[Kapitsa] You link the need for an end to nuclear weapons tests with the danger of a build-up of nuclear weapons and with the Strategic Defense Initiative. What do you have to say about the siting of nuclear weapons in space and the militarization of space?

[Taylor] I worry about that idea a great deal. All those with whom I have spoken about this are worried in case this happens.

[Kapitsa] Perhaps we could hear the point of view of the Europeans on these questions. What do you think about this, Carlo?

[Bernardini] What Dr Taylor said about the possible further improvement of nuclear weapons seems to me to be particularly dangerous not so much in its application to open space as to the use of them on earth. This must cause alarm among all Europeans, because Europe turns out to be the most likely place where military action will occur. North Europeans have already experienced this, and now we Mediterraneans are also coming up against this danger. There are many military bases on territory in the Mediterranean zone. A large quantity of nuclear weapons has been sited there. As far as I know, more than 600 nuclear warheads are sited in Italy. This gives rise to serious fears not only as far as I am concerned, but with many other people too.

It is essential for some steps to be taken, if only by public opinion, in response to the moratorium that has been declared by the Soviet Union. This is a very important step. As one of my colleagues taking part in our conference, Dr (Cotono Muzino), noted, from the viewpoint of the new thinking, it is essential that the Soviet Union continue to insist upon the moratorium although we are not asking for immediate reciprocal measures. [English original of this statement is audible and runs as follows: "The Soviet Union should insist on moratorium without asking for immediate reciprocation."] I am sure that this is, of course, not easy. But it is in this that the new thinking is displayed. Only an initiative of that kind is capable of forcing the opposite side into making mutual concessions. This, however, cannot be demanded at

once, from the very beginning. In that case, it becomes political pressure. I hope that the Soviet Union will continue to defend this initiative, to insist on this demand, for it is an important step toward a treaty banning nuclear tests completely.

[Kapitsa] It would be interesting to hear the opinion of Dr Duerr as another European representative.

[Duerr] I have the impression that what we are worried about most of all is not the fact that nuclear war might break out because of what one side of the other decides to do, but by the fact that it might be provoked by a chance accident, not just a purely technical accident, but a political and a technical accident in one. It seems to us to be particularly important, therefore, to avoid situations in which the military systems continue to destabilize, and this means that it is essential to put an end to tests. As you correctly noted, tests are essential for verifying new types of nuclear weapons, which naturally hampers the establishment of an equilibrium. Hence, there should be an end to tests. We are very happy that the Soviet Union has declared a moratorium, having taken the first step in this direction.

[Kapitsa] That is a very important point.

[Duerr] One should not forget, however, that the first step in declaring a moratorium does not remove the danger of nuclear war. It only lengthens the fuse, and we must use this time in order to achieve concrete measures in bringing nuclear armaments down to a normal level as Gorbachev proposed. Thus, if the moratorium is going to continue to operate even if it is not accepted by the other side, we must concentrate our efforts and use the time more effectively for carrying out weapons reductions because this is only the first step. Our task is to achieve stability where the crisis is most likely. This possibly means that on European territory, nuclear weapons must be withdrawn from those places where they are situated too close to each other. This, of course, will not solve the problem completely. It will, however, minimize the possibility of a chance disaster.

[Kapitsa] There is a threat to life in such places.

[Bernardini] Quite right. I would like to add that I agree completely with professor Duerr. The following question has occurred to me: Suppose that the Soviet Union decides to destroy 2,000 warheads. This will have a considerable effect on the total number of weapons. That would be a very important initiative that would not have destabilizing consequences. The Soviet Union now occupies a unique position. I understand that to ask this, too, of the Soviet Union would be too much.

[(Subramanian)] The Soviet Union cannot do everything. Steps must be taken in response by the other parties. Of course, as a great power in the international system, it can make serious concessions; the concessions, however, must be reciprocal.

[Duerr] In particular on the Strategic Defense Initiative. I cannot really see how the Soviet Union can carry out a reduction in attack weapons before the opposite side takes measures in response.

[Bernardini] Response measures by the United States might proceed along two channels: In the first place, they might be by the administration, which, also, does not strive to take such measures; on the other hand, public opinion must gather strength in order to influence Congress.

[Kapitsa] I think an understanding of these problems is extremely important. That is the point of our forum, of our gathering together. You have mentioned the possibility of reducing nuclear armaments. The fact is that we have now stocks of nuclear weapons that are such that their quantity does not have any substantial significance.

[(Subramanian)] We already have talked about this in connection with the nuclear winter concept and have called for a sharp reduction in nuclear weapons stocks.

The existing quantities of nuclear weapons do not have any practical meaning any more.

[Duerr] I agree, but from the military point of view, it is obvious that a reduction in nuclear weapon is not a substantial thing. But, from the psychological point of view one cannot understand why one side has to reduce its weapons while the other does not. Although in the present case there is no direct threat of war, from the psychological viewpoint this does not make sense.

[(Subramanian)] Sometimes it is thought that this is a position of weakness rather than one of strength.

[Kapitsa] However, I consider that we must defend the positions of the new way of thinking and follow its principles, no matter how paradoxical they may appear to be.

[Duerr] It is remarkable that at this conference we are speaking about the new way of thinking. I would like to stress that scientists must think not just about how the arms level can be reduced, about the danger of using arms, but that they also must come forward with initiatives and point out other tasks that face mankind, extending these initiatives into other fields.

[Kapitsa] Now, over to you, Ram.

[(Subramanian)] The late prime minister of India, Indira Gandhi, the prime ministers of Sweden, Argentina, Mexico, and Tanzania have taken up the initiative to act in the capacity of the third, neutral or nonaligned, side in order to assist in solving this issue. They correctly pointed out that as nuclear weapons are developed and improved, there arises a requirement to test them, which leads to a growing danger of nuclear war. Nuclear war is not a two-sided affair; it is more three-sided, between the United States, Europe, and the Soviet Union.

We are also worried about other factors connected with nuclear war. These changes in the wind, which was both described in the Soviet scientists' tests in the book "The Night After" and about which the U.S. scientist Carl Sagan has written.

As you remember, prior to the adoption of the partial test ban treaty, the Pugwash meetings, the Nehru movement for disarmament, and high-level meetings in Sweden played an enormous role in the preparation of that treaty and made the public aware of such facts as, for example, the accumulation of strontium in water and in milk, which subsequently got into children's lungs. At that time, it was not possible to conclude a universal test ban treaty because of the mutual mistrust of two powers. Today, on the initiative of six countries from five continents, we say: fine. We take upon ourselves the moral responsibility to be your arbiters. At the conference, it was pointed out that if 225 seismometers were to be placed around the world, they would register all tests. New Zealand instruments are already registering a series of tests. I think the time has come for us, scientists, to take this initiative upon ourselves.

We can have been leaving it in politicians' hands for too long, especially as we as physicists to a great extent are responsible to mankind for what is taking place and we must make up for our sins.

[Kapitsa] I would like to talk very briefly -- without going into technical details as our viewers are more interested in results -- about practical possibilities for monitoring.

[Taylor] Presently we have available technical resources for determining explosions of down to 1 kiloton and even somewhat less. Modern technology employs methods such as statistical analysis and high-frequency detectors that make it possible to effectively differentiate between nuclear explosions and natural phenomena such as earthquakes, and others things. Progress in this this field is very important. At conferences it has been frequently pointed out that material results could be achieved with the cooperation of all countries, especially with the participation of such nuclear powers as the United States and the Soviet Union. Also, this would not allow any one country to maintain a lead in a nuclear arms race. This kind of cooperation has already been started between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council.

[(Subramanian)] I think they are striving for expanding cooperation.

[Taylor] The entire world is ready for it.

[Kapitsa] Both sides are ready to expand cooperation. Your seismologists and seismometers are right next to our testing grounds.

[(Subramanian)] Scientists even from Australia and New Zealand came to the Moscow forum. For almost the first time in the history of the scientific community, were discussing such important questions. This reminds me of the Pugwash meetings prior to the signing of the partial nuclear test ban treaty. Now we scientists are trying to get a solution to a most important problem: the destruction of nuclear weapons.

[Duerr] the establishment of test monitoring will not solve all problems. The main thing now is to start action, to move ahead; the remaining problems can be solved in the future. The most important thing now is to get an agreement for cooperation on this issue.

[Kapitsa] That is a very important idea. Monitoring can be approached from two positions. The first is to treat your opponent with mistrust, suspecting him of deception; the second position is striving for cooperation, mutual understanding, and confidence, the principles on which, in the final analysis, all human relations should be based.

[Bernardini] I would like to note that European scientists who came to this forum think that this matter not only concerns the United States and the Soviet Union, and does not amount to establishing mutual confidence. The issue is much more complex and much wider.

[Kapitsa] Swedish seismologists make a great contribution to this matter.

[Unidentified voice] Swedish seismologists have given significant support to this initiative.

[Bernardini] In my opinion, various governments should be approached about bringing in additional scientific representatives to work in the groups at the monitoring stations.

[Kapitsa] I was actually present at the discussion of the setting up of the U.S. and Soviet groups for test monitoring. The discussion was attended by scientists from India and a representative from Sweden. Representatives of the USSR Academy of Sciences and other organizations took part in the discussion.

[(Subramanian)] General Secretary Gorbachev has set the world the task of full destruction of nuclear weapons, of reducing them to nothing. But first, it is a question of freezing arms by 50 percent. [as heard] I have no doubt that the Chinese will join in this proposal, and among the Europeans, the French will support it. I think that all nuclear powers should support a universal nuclear test ban treaty.

[Duerr] I have a question. Having signed a nuclear test ban treaty, each side could begin suspecting the other of cheating. But if nonobservance of treaty was discovered, it would above all harm the transgressors themselves as it would lead to a breaking of the whole structure, in which none of the sides are interested. Therefore I do not believe that any of the participants of that treaty would violate it.

[Kapitsa] Perhaps that is why it is so difficult to sign it. [laughter]

[Taylor] It is a big commitment to decide to join a moratorium. The process has only just begun and it should be continued.

[Duerr] A partial test ban treaty is only a sort of threshold, and once we have stepped over it, we should strive for a (?full) ban on all nuclear weapons tests.

If an end is put to all types of nuclear weapons, irrespective of their size and quantity, then all scientists would work on that. So far, we have only reached the threshold; a partial nuclear test ban treaty has been concluded. But that is not yet a moratorium.

[(Subramanian)] I would like to add that we should achieve a moratorium and then continue striving for the totally eliminating nuclear weapons, of reducing them to nothing, as Comrade Gorbachev put it. that is our ultimate goal.

[Bernardini] Here another delicate question arises: I have heard it said many times that one of the causes that stands in the path of the conclusion of a nuclear test ban treaty is that a large number of specialists engaged in that field would become redundant. They cannot, after all, be turned into theoreticians of military problems.

[(Subramanian)] Why, plenty of work could always be found in high energy physics with accelerators. The Swedish example shows how a large number of scientists engaged in military projects were switched over to other subjects, not connected with armaments. For example, employees of the [word indistinct] National Defense Institute started work in seismology. There were not that many of them, after all.

[Taylor] The dismantling of the war machine is a technical job of enormous magnitude, requiring great technical effort. Who are the best people to deal with this task? They are the people who created those weapons. I think some of them would do it with great relief.

What am I doing myself? I am working on a project in which we are getting ready to eliminate 329 nuclear weapon units in the United States and the Soviet Union. I am preparing to work on plans for their dismantling, a process that will be taking place under monitoring by the IAEA with a group of entirely new people. That is what we have to do. That is creative work that will require deep knowledge and intuition.

As far as nuclear warheads for star wars are concerned, everything there will be even more complicated. As far as the transition period is concerned, in all countries the destruction of nuclear weapons represents a very serious international undertaking requiring immense amounts of work.

[(Subramanian)] I think that these kinds of forums should be held more often in various countries. Our movement should develop. Our task is to win over public opinion throughout the world, to set it against nuclear weapons tests. These ideas have already permeated into mass media, into the United Nations, into various public and scientific organizations. We should not ease the pressure.

[Akpitsa] We are struggling against a danger that faces all of us without exception. It is a universal problem, one of the lessons we have learned.

[Duerr] We have one advantage. In our scientific community there continues to exist mutual confidence and understanding. It is as if we were on an island and it is easy for us to understand one another. But our task is to convince people outside of the extent of our circle. Starting with ourselves, we should take in ever wider circle of people. The main trouble is lack of confidence. This does not apply to the scientific circles. Scientists are conducting joint research, cooperation in the fields of physics of elementary particles, seismology, and so on. The cooperation should spread into ever new areas of practical activity. We already have sufficient experience of international cooperation.

[Unidentified voice] Any cooperation between Soviet scientists and scientists of other countries has very positive significance.

[Kapitsa] What you have said about the possibility of transforming military laboratories is strengthened by the example of the rocket industry. Rockets were created for the military industry and then they began to be used in space research. Military cosmodromes began to be used for launching the rockets. It is clear from this example how technology engendered for military purposes is being very widely used for space research. Psychologically this can make people happy.

[Taylor] I have a great many acquaintances, colleagues who transferred from the field of high-energy physics, for example, to biology, where they do completely different research and work with great interest and enthusiasm.

[Duerr] Apart from that, we also have to define topical, universal problems that require urgent solution and think about their technical realization. I am greatly troubled by the fact that we have to expend so much talent and effort on destruction instead of making use of it in other fields requiring talented ideas.

[(Subramanian)] Meteorology, for instance.

[Duerr] Why should talented people not be put to use in other fields, where an entirely different spirit reigns?

[Bernardini] The thing is that talent sometimes follows money.

[Kapitsa] And money follows talent; these things can sometimes be connected in peculiar ways. Dr Taylor has mentioned in our discussion that nuclear weapons might be used in the SDI; there is a peculiar connection between these. What would you like to say in conclusion?

[Bernardini] In conclusion, I would like to note with satisfaction that we are on the threshold of new contacts with the Soviet Union. The present forum has certain specific features. It was organized by an international initiative group, which was supported by the USSR Academy of Sciences. The academy offered us hospitality. We invited a great number of scientists from various countries, who responded to our invitation and came to Moscow. Considering the short period over which the invitations were sent, this fact is very revealing.

Now the most important thing for us is to work out a document we could address to politicians, to our colleagues -- this too is very important -- and also to all people connected with arms control-related activity. That is the most complex task. We will have to deal with hawks whose position is very strong. It is stronger than that of the doves. A U.S. colleague said that a hawk is a specialist engaging in activity of a specific kind, whereas a dove is an activist who deals with many things at the same time. We not only have to deal with our immediate work.

[(Subramanian)] Do you think that we should enter into discussion with the hawks?

[Kapitsa] We invited Teller to our conference.

[Duerr] I had a 1-hour discussion with Edward Teller on German television, but it was not too fruitful.

[Unidentified voice] I had a discussion with him on U.S. television.

[Duerr] We should not occupy very extreme positions; it is best to stick to the golden rule. There would be very little use of us trying to convince ourselves whether we should talk to other people.

[Kapitsa] To convert them.

[Taylor] All conference participants to whom I spoke support a full nuclear weapons ban treaty. This issue requires technical solutions and here we dealt, in part, with discussing a number of technical details. We cannot stop here. We should involve all people and create a firm basis for further disarmament measures; that is do what is obvious and necessary, involving an ever increasing number of people. Discussions polarize people.

[Duerr] We should not, perhaps, go for great compromises regarding the main tasks, although one must come to terms with them on the way to the objective. We have great prospects. Although they seem utopian, it is important to strive toward them step by step without stopping for a moment, otherwise we will never make it to the objective.

[Taylor] We will have to move toward the objective gradually, it would be too good to reach it at once.

[Subramanian] In the end we will reach our goal.

[Kapitsa] You said that our forum was successful. The reason for this success lay, first of all, in the fact that it was convened at a very appropriate time; second, because there is a very specific question on the agenda. For us it is not abstract theory, but a very specific task. We were discussing specific steps toward our common goal. We should keep to these tactics in the future.

[Duerr] In comparison with other problems the issue of halting tests appears to be the simplest one. Here there may arise some technical differences that it will be fully possible to solve. There is a much more complex problem. It is good that we have started with this issue. I believe that in the end it will be solved and the United States will share our point of view. I am not too pessimistic. Not now, of course, and perhaps not in the future... [as heard]

[Subramanian] The United States has its Taylors and we base our hopes on them.

[Duerr] I think that is how most people think.

[Kapitsa] Well, I would like to conclude our discussion here. We spoke today of new thinking. Presently at every level -- scientific, political, public -- it has become imminent to solve in a new way problems engendered by modern science and technology. We face the inevitability of formulating new public thinking, a new way of treating these problems. How should these problems be solved, through a new way of thinking or technologically? In simple terms, which is more important for solving the problem: technology or new ideas? In mankind's history, these two things have always been inseparable but today, old ideas have clearly become outdated.

[Duerr] Previous notions have grown old.

[Kapitsa] That is right. Today we should be developing a new spirit, searching for new approaches to these problems. Our international forum, our discussion today, I am convinced, will make their own contribution to solving this task, to the cause of forming the new thinking. I would like to thank you and to sum up our discussion in Russian:

It seems to me that our discussion concerned essentially a very complex and very urgent question in which the problems facing mankind have become focused with a great intensity. It demonstrated the significance of, on the one hand, the necessity of halting the nuclear arms race, the significance of the moratorium unilaterally announced by the Soviet Union and already extended three times. You have seen our foreign colleagues' attitude to this issue. On the other hand, it demonstrated the necessity of a new approach to and new thinking about problems of this kind. It is not through inventions, not through some new tricks that we can solve the problems facing mankind. We must search for new ways and new evaluations for making the appropriate use of those great reserves of science and technology that are at our disposal. That is (?probably) the main lesson. I think that both the discussion of these questions and the awareness of them should be at the center of attention of all those who are so concerned about mankind's fate. On this basis, I would like to thank all those taking part.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1517

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA CITES CANADIAN PHYSICIST ON MORATORIUM

PM071149 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[Interview with Derek Paul, professor of physics at Toronto University, by own correspondent V. Shelkov, under the general heading "Key to Disarmament"--date of interview not specified]

[Text] Ottawa--Derek Paul, professor of physics at Toronto University, recently returned from the Soviet Union. He took part in the international forum of scientists for an end to nuclear tests. The professor was received by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, as one of the scientists who initiated the conference.

I agree 100 percent with the Soviet proposal to conclude a treaty on the complete banning of nuclear tests, D. Paul stated. I am convinced that the CPSU leader is sincere in his desire to achieve such a treaty. And I believe, the well-known physicist went on, that the West simply must take this step. The first stage should be for the United States and its partners to join in the unilateral Soviet moratorium, and the second stage should follow soon after--the signing of an all-embracing treaty on ending nuclear explosions.

My scientist colleagues, the professor noted, have not given up hope that the United States will follow the USSR's example and join in its moratorium. Here American public opinion, which is inclined to favor such a step, should play a role of some importance. I repeat, I believe in the sincerity of the Soviet Union's intentions, and I therefore hope that even if your country has to resume tests, it will leave the door open for talks on a mutual end to explosions at any moment.

In the present conditions, D. Paul went on, it is simply impossible to increase your security by extending nuclear arsenals. On the contrary, the only way out of the impasse is to stop the arms race and move toward disarmament. The mutual renunciation of tests would be the key to ending the nuclear arms race. It would make it possible to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction. Those who believe that explosions are necessary in order to keep existing nuclear arms "up to scratch" are profoundly mistaken, the Canadian physicist noted. No, tests are absolutely indispensable only for the development and evaluation of new types and systems of weapons.

The scientist then dwelt on the so-called problem of verification. For many years now, he said, the possibility has existed of verifying the observance of a treaty on a general ban on nuclear explosions. Today, as a result of technical progress, verification is even easier. It is possible with an extremely high standard of accuracy. After the USSR agreed to on-site verification, the verification problem disappeared entirely. Anyone who claims that the fulfillment of the provisions of a treaty on ending all tests is unverifiable is either dishonest or ignorant.

Of course, D. Paul noted, the Western partners of the United States are making a big mistake in rejecting serious talks on the problems connected with a moratorium. This position only causes me regret.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1517

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: REPORTS ON JOINT MONITORING EXPERIMENT IN KAZAKHSTAN

Reliability Stressed

PM301357 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 86 Second Edition p 5

[Special correspondent A. Pokrovskiy report: "Reportage from the USSR Academy of Sciences Physics of the Earth Institute's Seismic Expedition: I 'See' the Nuclear Explosion"]

[Text] Kazakh SSR -- The electronic timepieces to be found everywhere in the offices here do not flash out our time -- that is Moscow or local time. You look at somewhat warily. Calibrated to an accuracy of hundredths of a second to Greenwich Mean Time, they are designed to record the time of any global event occurring in the earth's crust, whether it be natural -- an avalanche, Tsunami, or earthquake -- or artificial -- a nuclear explosion.

We were waiting for the explosion in Nevada, the 15th since the Soviet Union announced its unilateral moratorium. The previous one, the 14th was held very recently.

Its precise time was recorded here: 21 hours, 13 minutes, 1.16 seconds GMT on 17 July. It was done suddenly, without notification. It was accurately recorded at a distance of almost 10,000 kilometers. This time the day of explosion had been announced -- 24 July. But we did not know the precise time. All we could do was wait for the instrument readings. Out of naive habit, I wanted while waiting to see with my own eyes the needles of the seismometers placed somewhere below our feet in a 15-meter shaft shudder from the distant detonation. But it is impossible. Not just the sound of my footsteps but the heat of my body would affect the readings of the sensitive instruments specially designed to register the slightest changes in the world surrounding them.

However, the electronic boosters and digital instruments developed at the Physics of the Earth Institute would show and even "explain" what was going to occur somewhere beneath us.

"A seismogram roughly like this will be obtained," said V. Lampey, chief of the expedition, showing me, together with V. An, his deputy in charge of scientific affairs, a long tape on which the trace of the Nevada explosion is indicated by a peak 40 times greater than the usual microseismic background, attached to a computer printout of a tabulation produced by the specially developed "Seysmostantsiya" program.

I read the information recorded there: The seismic wave's approach bearing, its angle of incidence, length, and breadth. Using them, it is no longer a problem even for a non-specialist to determine the coordinates of the explosion's epicenter. And, then, the final figure -- the magnitude of the explosion, reading 5.2-5.3 points.

"For our instruments that is a very large magnitude," my interlocutors explained, "making it possible to draw accurate conclusions about the time and coordinates of the event even on the basis of a single observation instrument reading. If you want to, here in North Kazakhstan we can even pick up a large wave breaking in the Barents Sea."

Solid ground is not a very felicitous expression from the seismological standpoint. The planet beneath our feet sways and emits various sounds at every tremor, and a seismic wave traverses its body like a spasm whenever a particle of soil moves, albeit ever so slightly. And modern seismiological equipment is like an electronic microphone able to amplify the sounds of these movements a million times over. Thus the expedition here records soil fluctuations to hundreds of a billionth of a meter.

Here is another one of its features. It is well-known that seismic instruments are best placed on a firm base to prevent outside interference. The granite of the Kazakhstan platform satisfies these conditions in the best possible way. But when this region, with its low level of microseismic fluctuation and industrial disturbance, to use the specialists' parlance, began to be used for testing seismic instruments some decades back, yet another curious property of it came to light. The platform resonates and responds to the slightest underground sounds like a violin in the hands of a virtuoso. How and why this happens is not yet clear, but it has been established that this region detects better than any other region on the continent what is happening, for example, in the underground galleries of Nevada. American scientists, by the way, were able to see this for themselves recently. Their instruments, which were set up at Karkaralinsk, also on the granite platform but directly on the surface, not even in the shaft itself, precisely recorded the explosion whose seismogram was now in front of us.

Seismology as a science, of course, was not created and has not been developed by any means to verify [kontrol] the level of arms. The seismic waves detected by the instruments illuminate our planet, adding to our fundamental knowledge about its formation and supplying practical information about mineral deposits.

Unfortunately, the signals from underground nuclear explosions have interfered here in recent decades.

"But do they not have to be distinguished from the signs of the turbulent inner life of our seething planet?"

"Specialists have long known how to do that. Take a look, for example, at this collection."

I looked at the book "Underground Atomic Explosions," published in Moscow back in 1962. It is a translation of articles by American specialists based on material from studies of underground nuclear tests conducted in the United States. The phenomena are there examined in zones near, intermediate, and remote from the explosion and the relevant calculations and graphs adduced. I recalled that at roughly the time these articles were written, when specialists were increasingly coming to the conclusion that it was

feasible to record breaches of a ban on underground tests by national means of verification [kontrol], the United States refused to conclude an appropriate agreement. Then-president D. Eisenhower stated that the tests were needed by the United States to create "completely clean bombs."

Since then national methods of verification [kontrol] have improved even more. In particular, V. An, one of my interlocutors, wrote with Ye. Lyuke and I. Pasechnik an article that appeared in the volume of 285 reports by the USSR Academy of Sciences for 1985 which analyzes the recordings of explosions carried out by the United States at the Nevada test site from 1961 through 1983. The authors were able to establish on this basis even such a fine regularity as a 10-11-year period of variations in the parameters of seismic waves.

"You know," Vadim Aleksandrovich said, "the expedition archive is an object of special pride for us. During our 20 years of work here we have recorded virtually every underground nuclear explosion with a yield of 1-2 kilotons to 5 megatons carried out in the United States and other countries." The archive also includes more than 200,000 digital tape recordings of earthquakes. In short, the basis for deeper analysis and comparisons has been accumulated.

It remains to be added that, in addition to seismic waves, explosions are accompanied by a subsonic acoustic wave that causes disturbances of the earth's ionospheric layer and magnetic pole. Consequently, there are other ways of verification [kontrol] by ground-based and satellite means. The scientific basis and reliability of verification [kontrol] methods are increasing. Unfortunately, the stance of the U.S. Administration, which stubbornly refuses on various pretexts to conclude an agreement on a complete ban on nuclear weapons tests, remains immutable. Only now the dream of a "clean bomb" has been replaced by the intention of creating no less than a space-based military system.

"We have got it!" was the quiet comment of one of the monitors who man the instruments around the clock. The spasm from the latest Nevada explosion ran through the earth's body to its very core, rebounded somewhere under the North Pole, and then headed for the Kazakhstan platform, sharply pushing up the hitherto steady beat recorded on our "cardiogram" of the planet. We would obtain precisely measured parameters of the signal in a minute or so. But they have learned to interpret news from Nevada at a glance. The time was already precisely ascertained: A new nuclear explosion had been conducted there 780 seconds earlier.

As we were leaving the expedition we called into a new building. Shafts 100 meters deep had already been drilled into the granite there to house seismic equipment with a potential many times greater than that of instruments currently in use. Science is strengthening its arguments in the struggle against the atomic threat and on behalf of a peaceful future for mankind. May people's clocks, be they calibrated to Greenwich, Moscow, or Washington, henceforth record only peace time.

Soviet Scientist Interviewed

LD282020 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 28 Jul 86

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. experiment on monitoring nuclear tests is continuing in the Karkalinsk mountain and forest range in central Kazakhstan. Our correspondent Natalya Kalanina visited the scientists.

[Kalanina] Karkalinsk is an amazing place. Outcrops of bedrock which are known to be good conductors of any subterranean vibrations--opencast explosions, earthquakes in any point of the globe--surface here: The signal from a nuclear test in Nevada was recorded here 13 minutes 15 seconds later. Such is the way of propagation of seismic waves. The scientists work hard in a friendly atmosphere and understand each other well. They are brought together by a joint noble purpose, (Oleg Aleksandrovich Stolyarov), chief of a laboratory of the Physics of Earth Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and USSR state prize winner, said to me.

[Begin Stolyarov recording] The purpose of these experiments is to prove that presentday technical means are capable of recording explosions of practically any range or power at any given point of the globe with a high degree of accuracy. It ought to be said that our scientists and certain American scientists have long been aware of all this. But there are people, perhaps even scientists in America, who subject it to doubt. Apparently this, to a certain degree, suits the U.S. administration. That is why such arguments--first the impossibility of monitoring using national means and then, after the Soviet Union had given its consent for monitoring by means of each of the sides at relevant localities, the U.S. administration came forward with another argument against it; they started arguing that even these means are not sufficient. [sentence as heard] And if we manage to dislodge this argument, we can hope that this work will serve to speed up the process of reaching a very important decision on complete cessation of nuclear tests. [end recording]

/12858

CSO: 5200/1517

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET JOURNAL DISCUSSES NORDIC NFZ ISSUE

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 7, Jul 86 pp 115-121

[Article by V. Dmitriyev]

[Text]

Eva Nordland, a well-known activist of the Norwegian antiwar movement, has recently stated that today the peoples of Northern Europe keep wondering what they can do in their own countries, how those living in the North can help alleviate tensions; and what they as electors can demand from their politicians since the latter, being representatives of the people, hold sway over those countries.¹ According to Nordland, the answer to the above questions should be a demand to contractually formalise a nuclear-free zone embracing the countries in the northern part of the European continent.

The discussions which have flared up around that proposal in the countries of the region have resulted in a common understanding that the formalisation of the denuclearised status of Northern Europe in a treaty and legal form should include both an undertaking of the countries participating in the zone not to produce, acquire or deploy nuclear arms and a guarantee on the part of the nuclear powers to respect and not to violate the status of the zone and to refrain from the threat or use of nuclear weapons against the countries indigenous to the zone, irrespective of their belonging to military blocs.

The current broad scope of the actions undertaken by the public forces within the region in favour of the nuclear-free status of Northern Europe is undoubtedly linked with the recent aggravation of confrontational trends in the policies of Washington and its closest NATO allies, the trends which pose a direct threat to the stability and security of the Nordic countries. It is no secret that in the militarist plans of the United States and NATO Northern Europe is viewed above all as a military and strategic advance post adjoining important defence areas of the Soviet Union. In particular, construction and modernisation of US and NATO heavy weapons storage facilities, air fields, harbours, and electronic reconnaissance and tracking stations are under way in the territories of Denmark and Norway, with NATO military exercises held there becoming a regular fixture of their life. According to foreign analysts, those and other forms of expanded cooperation between Denmark and Norway, on the one hand, and the USA and NATO, on the other, result in a gradual erosion of the former's "bases" and "nuclear" policies (in joining NATO, the governments of those countries are known to have won reservations to the effect that they renounce the deployment of foreign troops and nuclear weapons in their territories in peacetime).

This circumstance is highlighted, in particular, in an article authored by William Arkin and Richard Fieldhouse from the US Institute for Policy Studies. While stressing the significance for the United States of the nuclear infrastructure facilities being constructed by the Pentagon in Denmark

¹ *Fred & Solidaritet*. No. 3, 1985, p. 6.

and Norway and serving the global network of the US strategic forces, the scholars indicate that the well-known "bases" and "nuclear" policies of the two states are thereby infringed upon. Besides, the article draws attention to the addition of Iceland, in accordance with American plan, to those countries in which nuclear weapons would be fielded in the event of an international military and political crisis.²

Such trends in the evolution of the strategic situation in Northern Europe, exacerbated by the deployment of new US Pershings and cruise missiles in some West European states, the missiles whose flight paths to the targets in the Soviet Union lie over the territories of Nordic countries, are causing well justified anxiety among sober-minded political and public quarters in those countries. Hence, their persistent efforts to hammer out regional security concepts that would permit to save the region from dangerous consequences of the nuclear arms race.

Notable in this connection is that as far back as 1978 Finland's President Urho Kekkonen linked the necessity to activate discussions on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe with the growth of the threat evoked by American plans to produce neutron weapons and the appearance of American cruise missiles on the European continent. Speaking in May, 1978 at the Foreign Policy Institute in Stockholm, he noted that "under conditions when disarmament negotiations are stalled and the development of military technology increases the danger of a nuclear conflict in Northern Europe, the Nordic countries should, in their own interests, begin, between themselves and together with other countries, negotiations with corresponding powers on arms control. Their goal would be the creation of a separate stipulated system for isolating to the highest degree the Nordic countries as a whole from the influence of the nuclear strategy, in particular from new nuclear military technology. Paavo Väyrynen, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Finland, stated in November 1983, that "the threat related to the stationing of cruise missiles in Europe adds to the significance of a denuclearised zone in the European North."

New Soviet initiatives aimed at solidifying international security and translating the concept of a denuclearised world into reality elicit broad support of the peace-loving democratic quarters in Northern Europe. North European political and social figures directly link the announcement made by the leaders of the USSR and the USA at the Geneva meeting on the inadmissibility of nuclear war and on renouncing military superiority with the necessity of taking actions directed at barring nuclear weapons from the North European region. In particular, former Prime Minister Olof Palme of Sweden, in addressing the conference of the Swedish Peace Forum of the Workers' Movement held in December 1985, emphasised that "in a situation in which the leaders of the two great powers state that a nuclear war should never be unleashed and that there can be no winners therein, it is only natural for all people throughout the world to declare that they do not wish to have nuclear weapons either... While the leaders of the USSR and the USA have agreed that nuclear weapons cannot be used from the military viewpoint, we could probably come to a unanimous opinion as to how to shield our region from those weapons of mass destruction."

As the most all-embracing mass form of the socio-political movement for peace in the North European countries, the struggle for establishing a nuclear-free zone there has drawn in the broadest strata of general public, involving representatives of the most diverse political trends: Communists,

² See *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, June-July, 1985.

Social Democrats, and sober-minded representatives of bourgeois parties. The activity of women's and youth organisations and of trade unions has noticeably risen in pitch. The actions in favour of Northern Europe's denuclearised status have also attracted a number of churchmen and numerous groups of peace champions formed on a professional basis (physicians, engineers, actors, teachers, etc.).

In fighting for a nuclear-free North, the leaders of major organisations of peace champions within the countries of the region see their most immediate task in uniting and coordinating the actions of the forces of peace and thus creating a powerful public movement, whose demands the parliament of any Scandinavian state would not be in a position to ignore. Working along these lines, the antiwar forces of Northern Europe have equipped themselves with various forms and methods of action such as mass manifestations, signature collection campaigns related to various appeals, seminars and conferences, petitions to the parliaments, and so on.

Judging by the public opinion polls, the denuclearisation proposal has to date won support of the overwhelming majority of the population in the Nordic countries. The movement for declaring nuclear-free zones in towns and individual regions of the North European countries has acquired a truly broad dimension.

Over a relatively short span of time, the antiwar forces of Northern Europe have managed to go from separate, nationally restricted actions to major moves on a regional scale. Their search for a realistic solution to the denuclearisation issue is known for its carefully considered and balanced approach, taking into account both the international situation as a whole and ways to ensure national security of individual Northern countries.

The peoples inhabiting that part of the European continent impressively raised their voice in favour of a nuclear-free zone in April 1985 when a People's Riksdag (Parliament) of the Nordic countries for peace, disarmament and development was convened in Sweden, gathering together representatives of major public organisations of the Scandinavian states. The forum took a unanimous stand for establishing a denuclearised zone in the North of Europe. According to its resolution, such a zone would be a very important confidence-building measure that would alleviate the threat for the security of the respective countries arising from the huge piles of nuclear weapons accumulated in the world.

As has been stressed by the participants in the forum, the North free of nuclear weapons above all means opening up a road leading to a nuclear-free Europe. The North European peace initiative is consonant with other similar initiatives advanced on our continent, for example, with the proposal concerning the denuclearised Balkans and the plans for establishing a corridor free of theatre nuclear weapons in Central Europe.

Having declared that the nuclear-free zone in the European North could be viewed as the region's most important contribution to the efforts at establishing a denuclearised world, the delegates to the People's Riksdag called upon their governments to take necessary measures to thoroughly examine the issue of the zone and to move over to specific talks on related matters and consultations concerning guarantees as to its nuclear-free status. The delegates to the forum called upon all public organisations further to intensify efforts with a view to transforming Northern Europe into a denuclearised zone.³

An increasingly organised and mass character of the actions undertaken by the peace-loving Nordic public, naturally, focuses the attention of the politicians in their countries on the question of establishing a nuclear-free zone. It stands to reason that the impact of the antiwar movement on the parliaments and governments of the Nordic states or, more exactly, the

³ See *Uttalande från Nordiska Folkrikssdagen*.

mutual influence of those forces varies in each of those countries. It is quite understandable, for instance, that the peace-loving public in Finland supports the consistent foreign policy of its government, aimed at maintaining peace and consolidating the process of detente. A major direction within the framework of that policy is practical assistance to translating into life the idea of a denuclearised Northern Europe.

In their actions, the Swedish peace champions lean on the decision taken by the Riksdag which approved in June 1981 the recommendation to the Swedish government to maintain close contacts with the governments of other Nordic countries with a view to identifying possibilities of establishing a nuclear-free zone in the region as a phase in creating a nuclear-free Europe.⁴ A substantial impetus to the antiwar actions in Sweden was imparted by the vigorous foreign-policy moves in recent years by the Social-Democratic government in the sphere of disarmament and as a result of its statements in favour of creating a nuclear-free zone.

Not only does the Swedish social-democratic government provide moral support to various actions in defence of peace but it also renders considerable material aid to the antiwar organisations (for instance, this year it will amount to over 10 million kronor).

Different conditions for a broad public movement in favour of the nuclear-free zone have been evolving in the three Nordic countries—members of NATO, i. e. Norway, Denmark and Iceland, in which the positions of the right-wing conservative quarters, which perceive a threat to the militarist plans of the Atlantic bloc in any legal and contractual formalisation of the denuclearised status of the North European region, are still quite strong. In those countries, the growth of the antiwar movement has been going hand in hand with the sophisticated brainwashing campaign launched by the bourgeois mass media to influence their public opinion.

While declaring the issue of a denuclearised zone unfeasible, they have, in particular, called for considering that possibility only within "a broader European context". In the face of a vigorous attack by the forces of peace, the adherents of the NATO strategy of "nuclear deterrence" have tried cruelly to blackmail the peace champions. While charging them with "betraying national interests", they have alleged that the establishment of a nuclear-free zone would ostensibly jeopardise the very membership of Norway, Denmark and Iceland in NATO.

Yet, the pro-NATO forces have failed to paralise, by threats and blackmail, the antiwar movement in those countries, whose participants have strongly rebuffed them. For their part, the movement's leaders have noted that in their activities undertaken on all levels in order to turn the North into a nuclear-free zone they do not raise the issue of Denmark's or Norway's membership in NATO.⁵ Rejecting all the accusations of wishing to jeopardise Denmark's continued presence in the North Atlantic alliance, the Danish peace champions, in the words of L.-B. Nilsen, a leader of the Social Democrats Against Atomic Weapons and Militarism, have set themselves the task to "terminate Denmark's participation in the NATO nuclear planning and review the agreements on inter-ally commitments so as to prevent the appearance of nuclear weapons on the Danish territory under any circumstances."⁶

While the conservative parties of Denmark and Norway use every pretext to shy away from advancing the denuclearisation idea, Social Democrats in those countries, influenced by the mass public actions and taking account of the realities emerging in the North, have, in the long run, actively joined the movement for the practical realisation of that proposal. In

⁴ See *UD informerar. En kärnvapenfri zon i Norden*, Stockholm, 1984.

⁵ See *Fred & Solidaritet*, No. 3, 1985, p. 6.

⁶ *Fredsavisen*, No. 1, 1984.

particular, the programme of the Norwegian Labour Party has been adjusted with regard to that problem. The Danish Social Democrats have come out against stationing nuclear weapons in the country both in peacetime and in the times of war or in a crisis situation.

Referring to the issue of a nuclear-free zone, the chairman of the Social-Democratic Party of Denmark, Anker Jorgensen, stated in his interview to the Swedish daily *Dagens Nyheter* that what was involved there was a "specific confidence-building measure designed to strengthen peace and security. The zone guaranteed by the great powers would be a major step towards building security, deepening detente and improving East-West understanding. The zone would mean a possibility to hold off threatening developments in the world beyond the borders of the North and would serve as an example designed to bolster global security."⁷

Because the Danish Social Democrats have moved over to the positions of all-round support for the proposal to make the North nuclear-free and due to the increase in the Danish parliament of the proposal's advocates from other political parties important political decisions have been taken which found their reflection in the resolution adopted by the Folketing in 1984. The resolutions, in particular, make it incumbent on the Danish government to come out in favour of freezing nuclear arsenals and establishing a zone free of nuclear weapons in the North of Europe.

Social Democrats who traditionally play a prominent part in domestic and foreign policies of the North European countries as well as the movement of peace champions in the region strive to coordinate and harmonise their actions in the interest of implementing the idea of a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe. In April 1981, the social democratic parties and major trade union associations of the North European countries in principle agreed with the proposal providing for the formalisation of the region's nuclear-free status in a treaty and legal form.⁸ The process of involving Social Democrats more actively in the peace movement has also begun approximately at that time. In an attempt not to lose contact with broad strata of the peace-loving public, the Social Democrats, for their part, count on influencing them in the spirit of foreign policy guidelines of the social-democratic parties.

It is also symbolic that a number of organisations and associations coming out in favour of stronger peace but sticking to their own specific positions have been set up under the auspices of the social-democratic parties and trade unions, inter alia, the Peace Forum of the Worker's Movement in Sweden, the International Center of the Labour Movement in Denmark, and the Peace Union in Finland which has become noticeably more active. Through similar alliances Social Democrats have established cooperation with democratic social organisations in countries of this region.

Recently, their desire to take initiative in carrying out some actions and to coordinate efforts with a view to turning the North into a zone free of nuclear weapons has been manifesting itself ever more graphically. In particular, Anker Jorgensen, Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Denmark, took the initiative of convening the conference of peace champions of the Nordic countries in favour of the idea of a nuclear-free zone, which was held in Copenhagen in November 1984, while a leading role in preparing the meeting was played by the participants in the Swedish Peace Forum of the Workers' Movement, who joined the ad hoc working group comprising activists from the public organisations of the Nordic countries.

The leader of the Danish Social Democrats also took the initiative of convening a conference of the parliamentarians of the countries of Nor-

⁷ *Dagens Nyheter*, Nov. 24, 1985.

⁸ See O. Groth, G. Lassinantti, *Nordkalotten—en granslös utmaning*, Lulea, 1985, p. 136.

thern Europe on the question of a nuclear-free zone, which was held in Copenhagen in November 1985. The conference, which drew together 105 parliamentarians from Denmark, Norway, Finland, Sweden and Iceland representing 45 parties of different political leanings, reflected the growing popularity of the broad campaign for a nuclear-free zone, launched by the North European public.

The statements by the participants in the conference vividly demonstrated that, in expressing the will of their electors, the parliamentarians of the North European countries in their majority were supportive of the idea of the zone and were willing, according to *Dagens Nyheter*, to "undertake more vigorous joint actions to comprehensively examine and elaborate necessary preparatory measures". This was attested to by the joint appeal of the representatives of the social democratic parties, who called for setting up an interparliamentarian working group and a North European group on the governmental level, called upon to jointly tackle the issues related to the establishment of the zone.⁹

Having positively assessed the outcome of the Copenhagen conference, the leaders of major antiwar organisations of the Northern countries noted that even Conservative parliamentarians from the NATO countries of the region dared not openly to oppose the proposal related to the zone. According to the widespread view held by the local peace-loving quarters, the Copenhagen meeting of the parliamentarians has imparted a considerable impetus to the movement for making Northern Europe a zone free of nuclear weapons. Yet, it is also acknowledged that the road to establishing a nuclear-free zone is not easy and that it requires overcoming many difficulties and artificial pileups and logjams.

Given political will, realism in thinking, and a responsible approach to the destinies of the world, the governments and legislators of the North European countries, called upon to fulfill the aspirations of their electors, could probably in the near future undertake specific moves with a view to translating into reality the idea of a nuclear-free zone. In all likelihood, this is precisely the approach on the part of North European politicians and statesmen that Prime Minister of Finland Kalevi Sorsa had in mind when in his interview to the Swedish telegraph agency TT in December 1985 he expressed a hope that such a zone would be established in the 1990s.

An important stimulus to fighting for the establishment of the zone is provided by the position of principle held by the Soviet Union which not only declares its support for the idea but also is ready to grant appropriate guarantees. In particular, this country is willing to consider the issue of taking certain measures, and quite substantial at that, with regard to its own territory adjoining the zone, which could help strengthen the latter's nuclear-free status. The USSR would also be ready to discuss with the parties concerned the question of giving a nuclear-free status to the Baltic Sea area as well. Moreover, the Soviet Union does not make those moves contingent on the Western powers' positive attitude to the nuclear-free zone although the significance of establishing the zone for all its participants would certainly be greater if the NATO nuclear powers also assumed similar obligations.

On April 8th of this year the Warsaw Treaty states published an Appeal to the European states, the USA and Canada to create nuclear-free zones in Europe. Proceeding from the necessity of freeing Europe from the nuclear threat, working for completely eliminating nuclear weapons from peoples' lives, taking into consideration the experience accumulated in the area of

⁹ See *Uttalande från parlamentarikerkonferensen i Köpenhamn*.

creating nuclear-free zones as well as the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act, and striving to develop the all-European process, the Warsaw Treaty states have called on all European states, the USA and Canada to undertake vigorous actions for realising the proposal on creating a zone free of nuclear weapons in the European continent and support the efforts of states calling for its creation, including at relevant international forums.

Having expressed their readiness to take part in an in-depth and concrete debate between the states concerned to promote steps towards creating nuclear-free zones in Northern Europe and in the Balkans, the socialist countries have called as well for commencing talks between states concerned on creating a corridor free of theatre nuclear weapons in the centre of Europe.

The Warsaw Treaty states are convinced that the creation of nuclear-free zones and their effectiveness depend also to a great extent on the attitudes of other states, above all nuclear ones, to such zones. Thus, states possessing nuclear arms should take on the obligation of strictly respecting the status of non-nuclear zones, abstain from using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against states included in such zones. The allied socialist countries have announced that the creation of nuclear-free zones on the European continent should become an important step towards ensuring security for the peoples of this continent and ridding Europe of nuclear arms.

Gaining momentum and raising its voice for all to hear, the movement of the peace-loving democratic public of the region for establishing a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe joins the mainstream of powerful antiwar movements of the broadest masses of people on all continents who demand that an end be put to the militarisation of society and to the policies of aggression and war. The struggle for nuclear-free zones, which is being waged in various regions of the world, constitutes a positive development in present-day international life and reflects the longing of the common people for peace, cooperation and detente.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English translation copyright: Progress Publishers 1986

/9274

CSO: 5200/1526

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

CD SEISMIC EXPERTS SESSION--Geneva, 1 August (TASS)--By TASS correspondent Vladislav Ahishlo. A special expert group for international cooperation in discovering and identifying seismic phenomena ended another session at the Conference on Disarmament here today. The session was attended by experts from 22 countries. They unanimously adopted a report to be submitted to the disarmament conference, which deals with the results of a successful international technical experiment in the transfer of data concerning the parameters of seismic signals (the so-called first-level data) via the global system of telecommunications of the world meteorological organization, which had involved 75 seismic stations of 37 states throughout the world. The experts held a lively debate on the further tasks facing the special group in connection with the Soviet Union's proposal made at the Conference on Disarmament on 22 July 1986. They reached consensus about the fact that an international system of seismic control over a nuclear test ban should be created on the basis of the fullest possible use of all the latest developments in seismology and the automation of the processes of receiving, transmitting and interpreting first- and second-level seismic data. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 1 Aug 86 LD] /12858

CSO: 5200/1517

RELATED ISSUES

USSR JOURNAL STRESSES IMPORTANCE OF ARMS AGREEMENTS FOR EUROPE

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 7, Jul 86 pp 33-37

[Article by D. Sc. (Hist.) D. Tomashevsky]

[Text] The materials of the CPSU's 27th Congress, which accumulated work of fundamental importance done throughout the entire period preceding it and especially after the April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, which gave a fresh impulse to analysing and reassessing the realities of the contemporary world, to working out a foreign policy strategy in line with these realities, allow one to make an all-round assessment of the present situation in Europe and its prospects in the broad context of world development. First of all it is necessary to note that the real dialectics of the present-day world—a multifaceted and contradictory and yet an interdependent and in many ways an integral one—manifest themselves especially patently in Europe. For the Europe of our time is a zone of a high level of development of productive forces and social dynamism, a concentration of the main tendencies and contradictions of our epoch. Socialism is represented in Europe by a number of countries of the socialist community and capitalism by one of the three main centres of modern imperialism.

It is in Europe that NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, the two powerful armed groupings, possessing the most modern tanks, missiles, planes, are in direct confrontation. Europe is virtually crammed with lethal arms, including the latest and most destructive ones capable of snuffing out life on Earth.

Yet the buildup of nuclear arsenals continues. The 1980s, as is known, witnessed the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear weapons in several West European countries. The "star wars" plans of the United States are fraught with the danger of a further spiralling of the arms race in Europe as well and a corresponding further growth of the threat of war. As a consequence of the high density of population and oversaturation with armaments the Old World is more vulnerable to an armed conflict, the more so a nuclear one, than any other continent. And this circumstance especially underlines the interconnection, the intertwining of the destinies of the European peoples despite the difference of the roads of social development chosen by them.

Another circumstance is no less obvious—the interconnection of Europe's destiny with that of other continents. Having originated in Europe, both world wars drew the whole planet into their orbit while now an armed conflict started in Europe will inevitably bring about a catastrophe of global magnitude.

So there is every reason to say that averting a nuclear catastrophe is the key problem, a sort of "super task" of both European and world poli-

tics. And while the CPSU and the Soviet government, as is convincingly shown by the materials of the 27th Congress, display a political thinking corresponding to the present-day realities and are constantly looking for new ways of solving the urgent problems and advancing bold large-scale initiatives, the West, regrettably, displays a different attitude. Facts show that Washington is inclined to view the problems of European security having in mind its own selfish, hegemonistic aspirations and power politics assigning its West European allies the role of Washington's nuclear hostage, of a potential testing ground for the American doctrine of "limited nuclear war".

A continuation of this course threatens to destabilise the situation on the European continent, to undermine mutual trust and international security and in the long run increases the danger of nuclear catastrophe. This explains the timeliness and urgency of the repeated Soviet warnings to the Western states that attempts to find a way out of the situation by further perfecting the "shield" and the "sword"—regardless of under what guise, American or European, these attempts are being made—are not only illusory but also extremely dangerous.

The attempts by certain quarters in the West under the cover of the slogan of "overcoming Europe's split" to revise the territorial and political status quo resultant of the victory over Nazism and post-war development and also recorded in the decisions of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, can play a similarly negative role. It is contended in the West that these decisions are the cause of a divided Europe. One cannot accept this. The Soviet Union views the decisions of the above-mentioned conferences not only as a logical result of the war for which millions of people paid with their lives but also as a manifestation of the spirit of international cooperation that found its embodiment in the 1970s in the Helsinki Final Act and other multilateral and bilateral agreements.

No denying it, the situation in Europe continues to deteriorate, the danger of war continues to grow and the development of events is approaching the critical point. In short, there is ample cause for serious concern. But it would be wrong to view this fatalistically, from passive positions. The present course of events can and must be changed for the better. For contrary to what is sometimes said both in Western Europe and across the ocean the causes of the present situation are not rooted in the fact that there exist states with two opposite systems on the continent and not in their ideological implacability. It is the political course that has now become predominant in the leading circles of the United States and NATO, their emphasis on force and confrontation and the further intensification of the arms race that is the main source of the present threat to the European continent.

The exceptional, truly historic importance of the innovative approach to problems of ensuring a lasting peace on Earth that characterises the Party's foreign policy strategy worked out by the 27th CPSU Congress, the Soviet Union's latest practical actions on the international scene stands out in even greater relief against this background. The fundamentals of the all-embracing system of international security formulated in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee fully accord with the interests of the peoples of Europe. It seems that as compared to other continents the conditions in Europe are most favourable for a response to the new ideas of the 27th CPSU Congress on the matters of peaceful co-existence, for the active interaction of all states in the interests of creating a comprehensive system of international security, for genuine advance along this direction. Apart from the objective interest of all European countries in strengthening peace one should also have in mind the subjective factor as well.

Present-day Europe has an extensive and far-ranging potential of peace, reason and goodwill opposed to imperialism's aggressive policy. Its components are the might and the vigorous peaceloving policy of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community along the European direction; the strong positions of progressive democratic forces, the broad scope of mass antiwar movements; the realistic tendencies in the policy of many politicians in West European countries who realise the danger of the continued arms race; the constructive role of neutral and non-aligned states in the struggle to consolidate peace on the continent.

Besides, the ever growing interconnection and interdependence of Europe's peoples and states are not limited to their interests of survival and the common danger confronting them. The experience of international relations in Europe includes not only wars and conflicts but also the peaceful cooperation of states regardless of their size, social system and foreign policy orientation, as well as close economic ties and the mutual influence of national cultures. Europe has traditions of intensive political dialogue, of bilateral and multilateral negotiations, and it has displayed skill in looking for and finding points of contact and mutually acceptable compromises. It is not by chance that the idea of detente originated and brought the most tangible fruits precisely in Europe, as a result of which solutions were found comparatively quickly to many problems that had previously seemed to defy solution.

The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, signed in Helsinki on August 1, 1975, based on a sober account of realities and a fine balance of the interests of its signatories and at the same time being directed into the future, is a concentrated expression of Europe's positive experience and still existing peaceful potentialities. To this day this historic document can serve in many ways as an example of new political thinking and new political psychology, of a new approach to problems of peace, cooperation and international trust.

The objective preconditions of the peaceful coexistence of states belonging to two social systems in Europe that made possible the achievements of detente in the 1970s, still exist despite the drastic deterioration of the international climate as a whole. And herein lies a possibility of a turn for the better in world politics. Europe's historic chance is in the peaceful cooperation of the continent's countries. It is only on this path that Europe can safeguard its future and play a constructive independent role in world affairs. So as it is stressed in the Central Committee's report to the 27th Congress, it is important, "while preserving the assets that have already been accumulated to move further: from the initial to a more lasting phase of detente, to mature detente, and then to building of dependable security on the basis of the Helsinki process, of a radical reduction of nuclear and conventional weapons."

The Soviet Union regards Europe not as an eventual theatre of war but as the common home of the nations inhabiting it which must be saved from a nuclear conflagration at all cost. The USSR is a consistent champion of ridding Europe of all nuclear arms, both intermediate-range and tactical.

Proceeding from the need to follow up the philosophy of survival with bold and resolute actions, the Soviet leadership has come up with major comprehensive initiatives providing for eliminating all nuclear arms in stages by the year 2000. And the first concrete steps along this direction that have already been taken by it unilaterally and the joint measures suggested by it to the Western partners are directly concerned with Europe.

Thus, already in April 1985 the USSR imposed a moratorium on the deployment of its intermediate-range missiles and suspended the imple-

mentation of its other responsive measures in Europe. Within the framework of the programme of eliminating weapons of mass annihilation and averting the danger of war set forth in the Soviet Statement of January 15, 1986, it was proposed that all Soviet and American intermediate-range ballistic and cruise missiles in the European zone be liquidated already at the first stage of this programme. Then at the 27th Congress readiness was expressed to solve this question separately—without a direct link to problems related to strategic armaments and outer space.

The implementation of this measure requires that the United States undertake not to supply its strategic and intermediate-range missiles to other countries and on the part of Britain and France an undertaking not to build up their respective nuclear arsenals. The importance of the fulfilment of these Soviet proposals for scaling down the nuclear threat in Europe and for the continent's security is obvious. It should also be borne in mind that in the event the American missiles are totally liquidated the further presence of the Soviet longer-range tactical missiles in the countries where they are now deployed would no longer be necessary.

The creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the continent would be a useful step towards ridding Europe of nuclear arms. The USSR and its Warsaw Treaty allies have repeatedly declared their support for proposals to create such zones in Northern Europe and the Balkans, and also support for the proposal to create a corridor free of nuclear arms along the line separating the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries in Central Europe.

The idea of ridding the European continent of chemical weapons and the proposals of the socialist states to create chemical-weapons-free zones in Central Europe and the Balkans corresponds to the guidelines of the 27th Party Congress.

At the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe the Soviet Union and its allies pursue a constructive policy directed at bringing closer the positions of the sides and attaining mutually acceptable agreements. The new Soviet initiative aimed at reaching an agreement for the substantial reduction of all components of the land forces and the tactical aviation of the European states and the corresponding forces of the USA and Canada deployed in Europe evoked a broad, positive response in the world. The units subject to reduction would be disbanded and their weapons eliminated or stored on the national territories. All of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals, should be a geographic zone subject to reduction. The tactical nuclear weapons should be reduced simultaneously with conventional arms. The untenability of the contentions of the West about a mythical Soviet superiority in the field of conventional weapons as an obstacle on the road to nuclear disarmament is obvious in the light of the above stated.

Within the framework of the Helsinki process, which was highly assessed at the Congress, the USSR and its allies are pressing for results at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament, and want its first stage to conclude with the adoption of a substantive final document.

The Warsaw Treaty states come out for a steady continuation of the Helsinki process, for strengthening security and developing cooperation in Europe. At the recent (March 1986) meeting of their Committee of Foreign Ministers they formulated as follows their stand in respect of the forthcoming regular meeting of representatives of the ECSC member states this autumn: "This meeting should make a substantial contribution to improving the political climate and reviving detente in Europe and the world, to reaching agreement on new major steps to reduce the level of military confrontation on the European continent, to expand cooperation between European states".

The Soviet Union is no less active in the struggle for the attainment of these aims in the field of bilateral relations. It attaches much importance to maintaining political dialogue with the West European countries, and works for constructive interaction with them in the interests of a lasting peace and reliable security on the continent. This is evidenced, in particular, by the results of the Soviet leadership's meetings with the leaders of France, Italy and Finland before the Congress, and with the leaders of Sweden, Austria and Spain after the Congress.

The ideas and guidelines of the 27th CPSU Congress concerning issues of present-day international relations were received in Europe with tremendous interest and approval. They inspire the peace-loving public to struggle against war and militaristic preparations. A difficult and unrelenting struggle lies ahead because the centres of power in the West are not yet showing any sign of readiness to take joint steps with the USSR in the direction of disarmament. The denunciation of nuclear war and escalation of armaments in general terms has yet to be followed by appropriate practical actions. Meantime the latter continue to follow the beaten path of power politics. This applies, not only to the Washington Administration but also to the ruling circles of some West European countries. One cannot but be alarmed by the support given by them in this or that form to the "star wars" programme, by the continuing deployment of American intermediate-range missiles in several countries, the attempts at interference in the affairs of other states, the campaign to evoke hostility and mistrust in respect of the USSR and the other socialist community countries conducted by mass media.

The impression is that some Western leaders definitely lack realism, a sense of responsibility, political will and sometimes ordinary common sense in order to look at the world in a new way before it is too late and embark on the road of joint efforts proposed by the Soviet Union and capable of ensuring mankind's survival and a future without wars and violence.

In the light of this it is especially evident that the implementation of the lofty and sublime ideas of the 27th CPSU Congress on issues of peace and security will require a tremendous amount of work, persistent and consistent efforts by the Soviet state and all progressive forces of mankind.

This is the only way to provide wide opportunities for a fruitful international cooperation of all countries and peoples. And not only the people living in Europe but all the people in the world will benefit from this.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English translation copyright: Progress Publishers 1986

/9274

CSO: 5200/1526

- END -